

drawn. If there are no further amendments as in Committee of the Whole, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. FRYE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, May 31, 1906, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 29, 1906.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

John W. Vann, of Texas, to be collector of customs for the district of Brazos de Santiago, in the State of Texas, to succeed Charles H. Maris, whose term of office has expired by limitation.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Commander James H. Bull to be a captain in the Navy from the 26th day of May, 1906, vice Capt. Charles S. Sperry, promoted.

Lieut. Commander Frederick C. Bieg to be a commander in the Navy from the 26th day of May, 1906, vice Commander James H. Bull, promoted.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 29, 1906.

COMMISSIONER OF FISH AND FISHERIES.

George M. Bowers, of West Virginia, to be Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries in the Department of Commerce and Labor.

CONSUL.

George H. Pickerell, of Ohio, now consul at St. Michaels, Azores, to be consul of the United States at Para, Brazil.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

James K. Barnes, of Arkansas, to be United States attorney for the western district of Arkansas.

POSTMASTERS.

GEORGIA.

Stephen B. Vaughn to be postmaster at Augusta, in the county of Richmond and State of Georgia.

INDIANA.

Albert J. Frost to be postmaster at Portland, in the county of Jay and State of Indiana.

Ezra Hayes to be postmaster at Lawrenceburg, in the county of Dearborn and State of Indiana.

William Sholty to be postmaster at Windfall, in the county of Tipton and State of Indiana.

James G. Stanley to be postmaster at Ridgeville, in the county of Randolph and State of Indiana.

Samuel H. Teeple to be postmaster at Geneva, in the county of Adams and State of Indiana.

INDIAN TERRITORY.

Logan G. Hysmith to be postmaster at Wilburton, in District 15, Indian Territory.

Roy W. Lovett, to be postmaster at Bristow, in District 8, Indian Territory.

KANSAS.

Luther M. Axline to be postmaster at Medicine Lodge, in the county of Barber and State of Kansas.

MAINE.

Charles S. Akers to be postmaster at Norway, in the county of Oxford and State of Maine.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Dexter Grose to be postmaster at North Abington, in the county of Plymouth and State of Massachusetts.

MICHIGAN.

Andrew L. Deuel to be postmaster at Harbor Springs, in the county of Emmet and State of Michigan.

MINNESOTA.

William T. Callahan to be postmaster at Long Prairie, in the county of Todd and State of Minnesota.

Guy A. Eaton to be postmaster at Duluth, in the county of St. Louis and State of Minnesota.

MISSISSIPPI.

Joshua Stevens to be postmaster at Macon, in the county of Noxubee and State of Mississippi.

NEW JERSEY.

William B. R. Mason to be postmaster at Boundbrook, in the county of Somerset and State of New Jersey.

NEW MEXICO.

Fred O. Blood to be postmaster at East Las Vegas (late Las Vegas), in the county of San Miguel and Territory of New Mexico.

NEW YORK.

Vernon A. Kent to be postmaster at Westfield, in the county of Chautauqua and State of New York.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Eliza S. Craft to be postmaster at Williams, in the county of Yadkin and State of North Carolina.

James H. Ramsey to be postmaster at Salisbury, in the county of Rowan and State of North Carolina.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Thomas A. Cochran to be postmaster at Apollo, in the county of Armstrong and State of Pennsylvania.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn May 29, 1906.

John J. O'Connell to be postmaster at Marinette, in the State of Wisconsin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, May 29, 1906.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move the approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York that the Journal be approved.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly; I yield to the gentleman for a statement or a question. Whether I shall yield further than that I shall determine later.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, in view of the fact that the proceedings at the close of the session last evening were quite unusual and became a hardship upon certain Members of the House, the proceedings relating to the arrest and bringing of Members before the bar of the House should be vacated, and I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the proceedings of last evening in reference to the arrest and bringing before the bar of the House of Members be vacated. Is there objection?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri objects.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. PAYNE. Does the gentleman desire time?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I do.

Mr. PAYNE. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Three or four minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I remained here at work in the House throughout the day yesterday, and until nearly 6 o'clock. The Committee of the Whole was rising to go into the House when I left. I then went home—or, rather to my hotel—for the purpose, of course, of quitting the labors of the day, but particularly to make a long-distance inquiry about the very serious ill condition of my brother, seven or eight hundred miles away from here. While at the hotel an officer of the House came up and asked me if I had voted. I said no, and asked him, "What is the vote on?" He replied that the House was without a quorum and that he wanted me to go to the House, and held a paper in his hand—a warrant, I presume. I said, "Well, I am not going now for anybody," and then explained to him the very distressing condition of my brother, whom I was trying to hear from, and told him I was extremely distressed. I was unable to communicate with the attending physician—and have been even to this moment—and the officer

very kindly excused me. I then went down into the restaurant for my supper. There I saw a number of Members of the House and told them the condition of the House; that a call for a quorum was being made, but that I could not go. They came up. After I had finished my meal I went up into the lobby of the hotel and met a Member, who said he had voted and left "some time ago." I then went outside to see if the flag had been taken down from the House—in other words, to see and determine whether or not the House had as yet secured a quorum and adjourned. I could not see any flag. I then went back and telephoned to the House. I was informed over the telephone that the "House is still twenty-nine Members shy."

I was unable to telephone during this time to my sick brother or hear about his condition, so I got on a car and started to the House to help make a quorum, after I was excused you see, and was overtaken about Seventh street, or, rather, was hailed by my friend from Alabama Mr. WILEY and by my friend from Arkansas Mr. WALLACE, and by a gentleman who was with them, a deputy I suppose, one of the officers of the House at all events. I do not now recall his name, but he is here present. I then got in the carriage with them and we came up to the House together. We came into the Speaker's lobby together; I was a few steps ahead. At about halfway the Speaker's lobby, the gentleman who handles the mace, whose name is Mr. Pierce, inquired if we had been arrested. I laughed and went on and came to the door of the Chamber, turned and saw that he had stopped the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WILEY] and also the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WALLACE]. I waited for them to catch up. We walked on into the Chamber, and we were reported by this officer here at the bar as having been arrested. Now, that is the whole story as to myself. I state this and another fact, that hereafter we may improve on the manner in which the laws are administered in this House with reference to this kind of a matter. I stayed here in the House for a few moments, and then walked out into the Speaker's lobby and saw, with my own eyes, that Republican Members were not stopped and arrested by this officer of the House as we had been, but came in and simply voted, whereupon I asked this officer why he was drawing a distinction between Democrats and Republicans.

The Speaker is somewhat familiar with the language that I used at the door to this officer, as I would to anybody else under similar circumstances. I do not retract anything that I then said. I saw that he did not hail Republican Members that came by, he did not stop them and ask whether they had been arrested, and the fact that he did not stop them as he did the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WILEY], and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WALLACE], and as he would have stopped me if I had paid any attention to his order, is the point that I make against his conduct. I treated the whole matter, when he first addressed us, more as a matter of twitting us than otherwise. Of course, if I had known that the gentleman was really in earnest I, too, would have stopped. He had a little piece of manuscript in his hand. Now, Mr. Speaker, if Republicans are to be treated that way hereafter, all well and good. If Democrats are to be treated that way hereafter, all well and good; but I serve notice now upon the officers of this House that hereafter they shall treat all Members alike. I am willing to be arrested when I should be. If arrested in this case, I never was before. I have not been absent from the House very often, and would not have been this time except for the distressing conditions named overtaking me. I make no apologies now for my absence on this occasion. These facts speak for themselves, but I do insist that Democrats and Republicans be treated alike when the order of this House goes out to arrest its Members.

Mr. RUCKER rose.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Missouri desire some time?

Mr. RUCKER. I would not have gotten up if I had not wanted a few minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. I yield two minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. RUCKER. Oh, I would like to have five.

Mr. PAYNE. Very well; I yield five minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I am very much obliged to the gentleman for his kindness. It seems that we can not get anything here without placing ourselves under obligations to some gentleman of the House. Referring to the incident of last evening, I want to make a statement, inasmuch as this is going to be an experience meeting. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that late in the evening I left this House to go to my hotel. Just about the time of going to supper, as I call it, dinner as gentlemen sometimes call it, I received a telephone message that the

House was being called. I had a conversation with one of my Republican friends—by the way, one of the most elegant gentlemen in this House, who lives at the same hotel—and we agreed that we would eat supper hastily and get over here in order to vote and relieve the Chair and not delay the business of the House. A few minutes later (the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] said an officer; I deny it) a usurper so far as legal authority is concerned, a usurper from this House having no authority to arrest presented himself and asked us to come here with him. I came here, and I was the first culprit arraigned before the bar of this House. Gentlemen present expressed surprise and I confess I myself was surprised. Last week, Mr. Speaker, these same officers, clothed with the same kind of process, went to the baseball park and, as I am informed, arrested a number of Members, including one not far removed from the White House family, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], and brought them here, but there was no parade and their names did not appear in the Record. Other distinguished gentlemen on that side whom I see now were arrested and were even saved from the clutches of the very diligent officers of this city for running an automobile at a dangerous rate of speed and were brought here in custody of an officer, but no record was made.

Mr. SIBLEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman does not wish to make a mistake. A little newspaper pleasantry indicating that there had been a bicycle—

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIBLEY. A little newspaper pleasantry stated that the party, in returning to the House, had been followed by a bicycle cop and placed under arrest. Such was an absolute misstatement of facts. We saw no bicycle cop. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUCKER. Does the gentleman have personal knowledge of the instance to which I referred?

Mr. SIBLEY. There was no policeman seen, and no one spoke to us or hindered our free progress, so the gentleman should not make that statement, for he has not been correctly informed. We neither ran in excess of legal speed nor were spoken to by anyone on our way to the Capitol.

Mr. RUCKER. I am glad the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania was only arrested once on that occasion, and I am also glad there was no record made of that. Mr. Speaker, last night, I say, I was the first man arraigned before the bar of this House. On investigation I found some forty or fifty Members came in before me, but no man was arraigned. I appealed to the Speaker, and I told the gentleman then occupying the chair that there was some discrimination being employed in this matter. After that the Speaker pro tempore issued an order from his chair to the Sergeant-at-Arms to show no discrimination, and subsequently, Mr. Speaker, you were not here, but the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] was in the chair. After that interview with the Speaker pro tempore my colleague from Missouri and my good friend from New Hampshire, one of the best and most faithful men on this floor, were arrested in order to appease my wrath, I suppose, and I regret exceedingly that it was so. So far as I am concerned, I have no favors to ask of this House. I am glad the gentleman from New York is pursuing the policy which has characterized his course all through this session. He is so bent on mortifying some few Members that he seeks now to vent his partisan feeling against five Democrats, although it involves three good men on that side. I ask no favors of him.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUCKER. Can I have a few minutes more?

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, certainly.

Mr. RUCKER. Five minutes?

Mr. PAYNE. Two minutes more.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, am I recognized for five minutes more?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield five minutes?

Mr. PAYNE. I thought you asked for two, but the gentleman can have five minutes.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is so genial this morning that I hardly have the heart to say what I would like to say. [Laughter.] And I apprehend that if I should say all I feel like saying and all that the occasion warrants, the gentleman would ask to have it stricken from the Record.

Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat again, as shown by the Record at the time the doors were closed, that there were about 260 Members absent from this floor. One member of the police force of the Sergeant-at-Arms, under the direction of the Chair, after making a most diligent effort, succeeded in bringing four Democrats and one Republican into this House. One other succeeded in bringing in two Republicans, and one other a Demo-

crat. So I say that, out of 260 absent Members, the RECORD shows that five Democrats and three Republicans only were arrested.

Now, I care nothing about it. But I say to you, Mr. Speaker, while I do not believe and do not expressly charge, or do not charge, that this discrimination was winked at or directed by the Chair, I say that the discrimination shown yesterday was foul and contemptible, and I say, sir, that, so far as I am concerned, the officers of this House may do what they please, and I will go forth with my head erect, unmortified and unhumiliated by anything that can be done in this House. Why is it that distinguished Members of the other party are permitted to come in here, according to the uniform practice prevailing here, and are permitted to vote and go undenounced by the RECORD of this House, while others are made a parade of? Then why is it that the gentleman from New York, who is the author of this dilemma, as some seem to think, objects to the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCLEARY] to strike from the RECORD that which is unpleasant to some of his colleagues? Does he think that it humiliates me or any of my colleagues? If so, I want to relieve his mind as to that, because I tell him it is not in his power to humiliate me.

Now, let me say again that it is a little remarkable, if the Speaker did it, that he would issue a warrant yesterday evening to be served upon a lot of Democrats, when this same Speaker within the last few days had to send clear to the baseball park to bring in distinguished members of his own party in order to make a quorum on this floor and no record whatever made of it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am always good-natured, and I will not trespass upon the patience of this House, but place myself square with the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], by yielding back to him the time I have not consumed. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] yield me a few moments?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MURPHY] can hardly take me off the floor for a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri rises to a question of the highest personal privilege. The motion before the House is to approve the Journal. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] has the floor. In the opinion of the Chair the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MURPHY] can raise his question of the highest personal privilege when the gentleman from New York is not upon the floor.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Does the gentleman state that his question of personal privilege grows out of the approval of the Journal?

The SPEAKER. No; nor has the Chair conceded that it would make any difference if it did, in the time of the gentleman from New York. The gentleman from Missouri can not take the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] off of the floor upon a question of personal privilege, in the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, what does the gentleman [Mr. WALLACE] desire?

Mr. WALLACE. I am one of the arrested parties.

Mr. PAYNE. Was the gentleman arrested?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. WALLACE. Three or four minutes, I suppose—say five minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Five minutes?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, sir.

Mr. PAYNE. I yield five minutes.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Speaker, I am not in the least out of humor this morning, although I was subjected to the course of the law on yesterday afternoon. I simply wish to detail the situation in as few words as I can, regarding myself alone. I refer to this matter not as a partisan one, nor in that spirit do I ask the attention of this House.

Mr. Speaker, it may have passed your mind for the moment, but the RECORD will show that about the first of this month I was appointed upon the committee to investigate charges against the Government Asylum for the Insane. Of course you know how busy members must be on that kind of a committee. We held a meeting yesterday afternoon, and I came to the House with my bulk of testimony and remained here and cast my vote on the roll call for adjournment. Then thinking that would be the last call, I went down to my home for the purpose of

taking an early start and go through that testimony last night. But I was informed there was another roll call over here. I immediately returned to this House, and cast my vote upon that call, out of which grew the order for these arrests. I stayed here and cast my vote for a quorum on the roll call under consideration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel that I did my duty toward this House on yesterday evening. I have explained to you why I could have no idea of dodging any duty or in any sense play the filibuster. I was simply undertaking to discharge my duty to this House as well as I could, and also to the committee of the House on which I was appointed. So, Mr. Speaker, when the officer came to my dinner table last evening and told me that I was wanted on a roll call—he did not know exactly what it was, and I was not certain. I did not finish my meal. I got up, went out, and took a delightful ride with him up to this Capitol; and in that particular I want to say he is the only gentleman, I believe, who has ever been so courteous and kind. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel, in regard to this matter, while I am asking nothing at the hands of the House, and do not ask it to vacate the record for me, I only want it to be understood that I was discharging my duty toward this House and toward the committee. In other words, I was working somewhat overtime in discharging the double duty of a committeeman and of a Member of this House. Under those circumstances I feel like I was simply the victim of a mistake. [Loud applause.]

Now, as to the rapidly changing customs and practices of the other side of the House, its inauguration of new and its revival of old methods, I think it might be in the mood this morning to repeat to itself the words of Oliver Wendell Holmes, to wit:

If I change with the winds that blow,
It is only because they made me so,
And the people would think it wondrous strange
If I, a weathercock, should not change.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. FITZGERALD. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is it in order now to move that the record of these arrests be expunged?

The SPEAKER. It is not.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is it in order, if the gentleman would yield for this purpose, to make a motion to amend the Journal by expunging these arrests? I ask the gentleman if he will yield for that purpose, in order to have that motion made?

Mr. PAYNE. Well, I will consider that later.

Mr. Speaker, it will not be denied that it is the duty of every Member of the House to be present in his seat from the time the House meets until it adjourns. That is what we are here for—our primary duties; and that has been the idea of Congress from time immemorial. Why, it has been enacted by statute that every Member who is absent shall forfeit his day's pay pro rata for his day's absence; and I can remember the time when this rule was enforced, and that some Members forfeited as much as \$100 and \$600 of pay. A number of Members were fined those amounts, and fined by the operation of the law itself.

Now, early in the history of Congress, a rule was adopted for bringing in absent Members, and I desire to read it to the House, because of the fact that many Members do not take the time to read the rules of the House for themselves. I desire to read the old rule under which a quorum was secured:

In the absence of a quorum, fifteen Members, including the Speaker, if there is one, shall be authorized to compel the attendance of absent Members, and in all calls of the House the doors shall be closed, the names of the Members shall be called by the Clerk, and the absentees noted; and those for whom no sufficient excuse is made may, by order of a majority of those present, be sent for and arrested, wherever they may be found, by officers to be appointed by the Sergeant-at-Arms for that purpose, and their attendance secured and retained; and the House shall determine upon what condition they shall be discharged. Members who voluntarily appear shall, unless the House otherwise direct, be immediately admitted to the Hall of the House, and they shall report their names to the Clerk to be entered upon the Journal as present.

Now, under that rule—

Mr. MURPHY. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. PAYNE. I can not be interrupted just now; I will yield to the gentleman later. Under that rule older Members of the House have seen many Members brought in here and brought to the bar of the House and heard them arraigned by the Speaker, saying, "You were absent from the House during the sittings of the House, without leave of the House. What excuse have you to offer?" The gentleman was heard as to whatever excuse he might make, and they were generally discharged from arrest; but they were compelled to remain in attendance, with the doors closed, until the House adjourned. That was the operation under the old rule.

But in the Fifty-fourth Congress the House adopted an additional rule for the attendance of Members. I introduced a rule

to that effect in the Fifty-first Congress, but the first suggestion of it came from an eminent Democrat from the State of Virginia, who first proposed something like this method of obtaining a quorum; and the rule was, from this suggestion, drawn out and adopted as clause 4 of Rule XV, and it was under this clause 4 that the House was acting last evening. A vote had been reached upon the final passage of a bill. It developed that no quorum was present; whereupon the Speaker proceeded under this rule, as he is authorized by the vote of the House to do, as the House had directed him by this rule to do:

4. Whenever a quorum fails to vote on any question, and a quorum is not present and objection is made for that cause, unless the House shall adjourn, there shall be a call of the House, and the Sergeant-at-Arms shall forthwith proceed to bring in absent Members, and the yeas and nays on the pending question shall at the same time be considered as ordered. The Clerk shall call the roll, and each Member as he answers to his name may vote on the pending question, and, after the roll call is completed, each Member arrested shall be brought by the Sergeant-at-Arms before the House, whereupon he shall be noted as present, discharged from arrest, and given an opportunity to vote and his vote shall be recorded. If those voting on the question and those who are present and decline to vote shall together make a majority of the House, the Speaker shall declare that a quorum is constituted, and the pending question shall be decided as the majority of those voting shall appear. And thereupon further proceedings under the call shall be considered as dispensed with.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Will the gentleman permit a question right there?

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, yes.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. If the rule authorized the proceedings to which you have referred, why is it that only 4 or 5 out of 250 were made examples of and these others excused?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, when we had reached a vote upon that bill, and it had been determined that no quorum was present, in order to relieve those who had stayed here all day performing their duty and not to compel them to wait until gentlemen who were absent had gotten their dinners, I moved to adjourn the House. The motion was defeated by a majority vote. Then there was no other way for the Speaker to perform his duty than the way in which he performed it.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Why arrest 5 out of 250?

Mr. PAYNE. Will you let me speak?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. As soon as you answer that.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not propose to answer your question until I get to it. Does the gentleman understand that?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Not perfectly, but partially.

Mr. PAYNE. I am glad it is permeating. The Speaker promptly did his duty. He ordered a call of the House; he ordered the doors closed; he directed the Sergeant-at-Arms to bring in absent Members, and they were brought in. The gentleman from Missouri, who has made a census of the matter, says there were eight brought in—five Democrats and three Republicans. The first two that came in were a pair of twins—the gentleman from Missouri, a Democrat, and also with him a Republican—showing that the Sergeant-at-Arms in that instance was not using any favoritism. One Republican, he said, was brought in by himself. In that instance he was using no favoritism. It is very easy for gentlemen to get up here in their mortification and pitch into the Sergeant-at-Arms and the officer of this House who has no voice here to defend himself. It is very easy for gentlemen to go out there in the corridor and denounce an officer of the House while that officer is at a disadvantage because he is an officer or an employee appointed by the House. But the Sergeant-at-Arms was directed to do his duty. The gentleman from Missouri says he will not say the Speaker directed the officer to arrest Democrats and not Republicans when he confesses that the Sergeant-at-Arms brought in both Republicans and Democrats. And if he suspects or has the faintest suspicion that the Speaker of the House of Representatives directed, hinted, or connived at in any way any favoritism in bringing gentlemen into the House he is the only man in the sound of my voice that is unworthy enough even to harbor any such thought or suspicion. [Applause.]

If these gentlemen had been here doing their duty, they would not have been arrested by the Sergeant-at-Arms. If they had been here voting on the proposition and staying here, they would not have been arrested or even invited to come to the Chamber by the Sergeant-at-Arms. We have had some little experience in getting a quorum ever since the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] adopted what seems to him to be some means to secure an end, and which every other gentleman in the Hall believes a means that will not have the slightest effect toward securing the end that he announces he has in mind. When the point of no quorum has been raised from day to day, and sometimes half a dozen times in a day, the Sergeant-at-Arms has invited men to come in here. The Sergeant-at-Arms did his full duty yesterday when he arrested men who did not come in here when he was inviting them to come. He exactly carried out the rule of the House. If he neglected to carry out the rule

of the House in arresting Members who did not come in on his invitation, then he did not do his full duty. Yesterday he did and some gentlemen came in here. They were put in the same category with many an honored Member of the House in times that are past that was brought in under the first rule I have read—brought up to the bar of the House and arraigned by the Speaker because they had not performed their duty, but had stayed away from the House.

Now, that is the record they have made, one by one. They come in and make an excuse and that has gone into the RECORD, and the excuse goes with the offense against the rules of the House, against the integrity of the House, against the interruption of the proceedings of the House because of their absence when they are needed here upon a vote.

I suppose they are content with the excuses they put upon the RECORD. So far as mutilating the Journal is concerned, it does not concern me one way or the other. You may expunge it, and, like the expunging at the other end of the Capitol so many years ago when the expunging did not expunge, it is there on the records to-day. You may expunge this proceeding, you may take it out of the RECORD; it does not matter to me one way or the other—it is there. The attention of the House has been called to this fact, that certain Members were absent and were brought into the House by the Sergeant-at-Arms. I do not think it will be a lasting disgrace to these gentlemen; I think they will outlive it. I think my friend from Missouri, who is so fearful that he will be humiliated, will recover from what occurred yesterday. It will answer a useful purpose if it calls the attention of the Members of the House to this rule, if it calls the attention of the Members of the House to the importance of their being present to do the business of the House. Some Members are asking every day when we are going to take a final adjournment. Well, our final adjournment is not hastened any by having to stop every few minutes and send out for absentees to get a quorum to vote on questions. It is important that Members should be here and perform their duty. Their first place is here in the House, and the rules are inaugurated for that purpose. I have no doubt that the Sergeant-at-Arms and the officers of the House did their full duty under this rule in arresting such Members as they ought to have arrested, without regard to whether they were Republicans or Democrats. It is said that two more Democrats were brought in than there were Republicans brought in. Well, naturally the Republicans ought to desire to dispatch the business of the House; they ought to come here more readily, and to come on a telephone call, than the Democratic Members of the House. The Republicans were not filibustering. Why, Mr. Speaker, I would not have been surprised if the officers going out to perform their full duty impartially and judiciously had caught nine Democrats out of ten Members from the ranks who I understand signed a paper agreeing to support the leader of the minority of the House in the filibustering tactics in the House. [Applause on the Republican side.] These officers have performed their duty here now for nine years, every one of them, and I have never before heard any complaint or criticism from any Member of this House, on either side of it, as to the manner in which they have performed their duty. Of course, when a man is in fault he wants to lay it on to somebody else; when a man is in the wrong he wants to put the wrong on other shoulders. Here are these gentlemen absent without an excuse, and the only excuse they seem to have is to try to raise a quarrel with the officers of the House who have no voice on this floor. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the approval of the Journal.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, before that motion is put, I want to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that at the time I rose for the purpose of moving to amend the Journal the previous question had not been demanded, and under the precedents it was held that a motion to amend was not in order, because the previous question had been demanded.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York had the floor.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] asked me a while ago for the privilege of making a motion to strike out this matter, and I will withhold the demand for the previous question and yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, before that is done, inasmuch as the gentleman from New York has referred to me in his talk, I hope he will yield to me.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, I do not think the gentleman is called upon to make a speech.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, but the gentleman made a speech at my expense. However, I will get in later.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend by striking out in the Journal all reference to the arrest and the arraignment of the Members of the House before the bar at yesterday's session.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, upon the amendment and upon the motion to approve the Journal I now demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out in the Journal all reference to the arrest of absentees at yesterday's session.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does that also strike it out of the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. The RECORD is under the control of the House and is not now under consideration.

Mr. OLMSTED. If it is proper, Mr. Speaker, I would include it now.

Mr. PAYNE. That would not be germane to the motion.

The SPEAKER. It is not germane to the Journal. The House has full control of the RECORD. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York, on ordering the previous question on the motion to approve the Journal, with the amendment thereto offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. OLMSTED.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS) there were—ayes 202, noes 69.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 177, nays 77, answered "present" 18, not voting 109, as follows:

YEAS—177.

Acheson	Draper	Kahn	Payne
Adams, Pa.	Driscoll	Kelfer	Pearre
Adams, Wis.	Dunwell	Kennedy, Nebr.	Perkins
Allen, Me.	Dwight	Kinkaid	Pollard
Ames	Edwards	Klepper	Powers
Bede	Ellis	Knowland	Prince
Beldier	Esch	Lacey	Rhodes
Bennet, N. Y.	Fassett	Lafean	Roberts
Bennett, Ky.	Fletcher	Landis, Chas. B.	Rodenberg
Birdsall	Foss	Landis, Frederick	Samuel
Bonyne	Foster, Ind.	Le Fevre	Scott
Boutell	Foster, Vt.	Lilley, Conn.	Shartel
Bowersock	French	Littauer	Sherman
Brick	Fulkerson	Longworth	Sibley
Brooks, Colo.	Fuller	Loud	Smith, Cal.
Brown	Gaines, W. Va.	Loudenslager	Smith, Ill.
Brownlow	Gardner, Mass.	McCall	Smith, Iowa
Burke, Pa.	Gardner, N. J.	McCarthy	Smith, Samuel W.
Burke, S. Dak.	Gilbert, Ind.	McCleary, Minn.	Smith, Pa.
Burleigh	Gillett, Cal.	McCreary, Pa.	Smyser
Burton, Del.	Gillett, Mass.	McGavin	Southwick
Burton, Ohio	Goebel	McKinlay, Cal.	Sperry
Butler, Pa.	Graft	McKinney	Steenerson
Calderhead	Graham	McKinley, Ill.	Sterling
Campbell, Kans.	Grosvenor	McLachlan	Stevens, Minn.
Campbell, Ohio	Hale	McMorran	Sulloway
Capron	Hamilton	Madden	Sulzer
Cassel	Haugen	Mann	Tawney
Chaney	Hayes	Marshall	Taylor, Ohio
Chapman	Hedge	Miller	Thomas, Ohio
Cocks	Henry, Conn.	Minor	Tirrell
Cole	Hepburn	Mondell	Townsend
Conner	Hermann	Moon, Pa.	Volstead
Cooper, Pa.	Higgins	Morrell	Wachter
Cooper, Wis.	Hill, Conn.	Murdoch	Wanger
Cousins	Hinsbaw	Needham	Watson
Cromer	Hear	Nevins	Weeks
Crumacker	Hogg	Norris	Wiley, N. J.
Curtis	Holliday	Olcott	Willson
Cushman	Howell, N. J.	Olmsted	Wood, N. J.
Dalzell	Howell, Utah	Olsen	Woodyard
Darragh	Hubbard	Overstreet	Young
Davis, Minn.	Humphrey, Wash.	Palmer	
Dawson	Jenkins	Parker	
Denby	Jones, Wash.	Parsons	

NAYS—77.

Adamson	Flood	Lester	Ryan
Bartlett	Floyd	Livingston	Shackelford
Beall, Tex.	Gaines, Tenn.	Lloyd	Sheppard
Bell, Ga.	Garber	McLain	Sherley
Brantley	Garner	Macon	Sims
Brundidge	Gillespie	Moon, Tenn.	Smith, Md.
Burgess	Gregg	Moore	Smith, Tex.
Burleson	Hay	Murphy	Spight
Burnett	Hefflin	Patterson, S. C.	Stanley
Butler, Tenn.	Henry, Tex.	Pou	Stephens, Tex.
Candler	Hopkins	Ransdell, La.	Sullivan, Mass.
Clark, Fla.	Houston	Rhino	Talbot
Clark, Mo.	Humphreys, Miss.	Richardson, Ala.	Underwood
Clayton	James	Richardson, Ky.	Wallace
Davey, La.	Johnson	Rixey	Watkins
Davis, W. Va.	Keliber	Robertson, La.	Williams
De Armond	Kitchin, Claude	Robinson, Ark.	Zenor
Dixon, Ind.	Lamar	Rucker	
Ellerbe	Lamb	Ruppert	
Fitzgerald	Lee	Russell	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—18.

Andrus	Glass	Hunt	Padgett
Buckman	Greene	Kline	Page
Dale	Hardwick	Lever	Sparkman
Dickson, Ill.	Hearst	Lilley, Pa.	
Finley	Hull	Mouser	

NOT VOTING—109.

Aiken	Flack	Lewis	Smith, Ky.
Alexander	Fordney	Lindsay	Smith, Wm. Alden
Allen, N. J.	Fowler	Little	Snapp
Babcock	Gardner, Mich.	Littlefield	Southall
Bankhead	Garrett	Lorimer	Southard
Bannon	Gilbert, Ky.	Lovering	Stafford
Barchfeld	Gill	McDermott	Sullivan, N. Y.
Bartholdt	Goldfogle	McNary	Taylor, Ala.
Bates	Goulden	Mahon	Thomas, N. C.
Bingham	Granger	Martin	Towne
Bishop	Griggs	Maynard	Trimble
Blackburn	Gronna	Meyer	Tyndall
Bowers	Gudger	Michalek	Van Duzer
Bowie	Haskins	Mudd	Van Winkle
Bradley	Hill, Miss.	Patterson, N. C.	Vreeland
Broocks, Tex.	Hitt	Patterson, Tenn.	Wadsworth
Broussard	Howard	Pujo	Waldo
Byrd	Huff	Rainey	Webb
Calder	Hughes	Randell, Tex.	Webber
Cockran	Jones, Va.	Reeder	Weems
Currier	Kennedy, Ohio	Reid	Weisse
Davidson	Ketcham	Reynolds	Welborn
Dawes	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Rives	Wharton
Deemer	Knapp	Schneebell	Wiley, Ala.
Dixon, Mont.	Knopf	Scroggy	Wood, Mo.
Dovener	Law	Slayden	
Dresser	Lawrence	Slemp	
Field	Legare	Small	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

For the session:

Mr. CURRIER with Mr. FINLEY.

Mr. BRADLEY with Mr. GOULDEN.

Mr. HULL with Mr. SLAYDEN.

Mr. MOUSER with Mr. GARRETT.

Until further notice:

Mr. DEEMER with Mr. KLINE.

Mr. BATES with Mr. GRANGER.

Mr. DIXON of Montana with Mr. PAGE.

Mr. WELBORN with Mr. GUDGER.

Mr. BARTHOLDT with Mr. LITTLE.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD with Mr. SMITH of Kentucky.

Mr. ANDRUS with Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina.

Mr. GRONNA with Mr. HILL of Mississippi.

Mr. HITT with Mr. LEGARE.

Mr. REYNOLDS with Mr. McDERMOTT.

Mr. DALE with Mr. BOWIE.

Mr. HASKINS with Mr. LEVER.

Mr. DOVENER with Mr. SPARKMAN.

Mr. GREENE with Mr. PATTERSON of North Carolina.

Mr. HUFF with Mr. WOOD of Missouri.

Mr. KNOPF with Mr. WEISSE.

Mr. LILLEY of Pennsylvania with Mr. GILBERT of Kentucky.

Mr. SOUTHARD with Mr. HARDWICK.

Mr. FOWLER with Mr. PADGETT.

Until Saturday:

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan with Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama.

For the day:

Mr. REEDER with Mr. SOUTHALL.

Mr. VREELAND with Mr. VAN DUZER.

Mr. WALDO with Mr. WEBB.

Mr. VAN WINKLE with Mr. TRIMBLE.

Mr. TYNDALL with Mr. REID.

Mr. MUDD with Mr. WILEY of Alabama.

Mr. MAHON with Mr. RANDELL of Texas.

Mr. LOVERING with Mr. PUJO.

Mr. LORIMER with Mr. MAYNARD.

Mr. LAWRENCE with Mr. McNARY.

Mr. KENNEDY of Ohio with Mr. LINDSAY.

Mr. HUGHES with Mr. LEWIS.

Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. JONES of Virginia.

Mr. DRESSER with Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. DAWES with Mr. GRIGGS.

Mr. BINGHAM with Mr. FIELD.

Mr. BISHOP with Mr. BROOCKS of Texas.

Mr. BARCHFIELD with Mr. BROUSSARD.

Mr. BANNON with Mr. BOWERS.

Mr. BABCOCK with Mr. BANKHEAD.

Mr. ALEXANDER with Mr. AIKEN.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH with Mr. MEYER.

Mr. SCHNEEBEL with Mr. PATTERSON of Tennessee.

Mr. KNAPP with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

Mr. DICKSON of Illinois with Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN.

Mr. BLACKBURN with Mr. SMALL.

Mr. KETCHAM with Mr. COCKRAN.

Mr. RIVES with Mr. TOWNE.

Mr. DAVIDSON with Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee.

Mr. LAW with Mr. SULLIVAN of New York.

For the vote:

Mr. ALLEN of New Jersey with Mr. RAINEY.

Mr. CALDER with Mr. BYRD.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Iowa rise?

Mr. HULL. I see I am paired with the gentleman from Texas, and I desire to withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The SPEAKER. Call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called Mr. HULL's name; and he answered "present."

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thought at first I was personally interested in this vote, but I find now I am mistaken, and I want to withdraw my vote of "present" and vote "no," that the Journal and Record may stand exactly as they are.

The SPEAKER. Call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. GAINES of Tennessee; and he answered "no."

Mr. LILLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I voted "aye," and find I was paired with the gentleman from Kentucky. I desire to change my vote from "aye" to "present."

The SPEAKER. Call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. LILLEY of Pennsylvania; and he answered "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The previous question is ordered, and the question now is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Division, Mr. Speaker.

While the House was dividing,

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 224, nays 7, answered "present" 17, not voting 133, as follows:

YEAS—224.

Acheson	Davey, La.	Johnson	Pou
Adams, Pa.	Davis, Minn.	Kahn	Powers
Adamson	Davis, W. Va.	Keliber	Prince
Alken	Dawson	Kennedy, Nebr.	Rainey
Allen, Me.	Denby	Kinkaid	Rhinock
Allen, N. J.	Dixon, Ind.	Kitchin, Claude	Rhodes
Ames	Draper	Klepper	Richardson, Ala.
Bartlett	Driscoll	Knowland	Richardson, Ky.
Beall, Tex.	Dunwell	Lacey	Rixey
Bede	Dwight	Lafean	Robertson, La.
Beldler	Edwards	Lamar	Robinson, Ark.
Bell, Ga.	Ellerbe	Lamb	Rodenberg
Bennet, N. Y.	Ellis	Landis, Chas. B.	Rucker
Bennett, Ky.	Esch	Landis, Frederick	Ruppert
Birdsall	Fassett	Lee	Russell
Bonyne	Fitzgerald	Le Fevre	Ryan
Boutell	Fletcher	Lilley, Conn.	Samuel
Bowers	Foss	Lloyd	Scott
Bowersock	Foster, Ind.	Longworth	Shackleford
Brantley	Foster, Vt.	Loudenslager	Shartel
Brick	French	Lovering	Sheppard
Brooks, Tex.	Fulkerson	McCall	Sherley
Brooks, Colo.	Fuller	McCarthy	Sherman
Brown	Gaines, Tenn.	McCreary, Pa.	Sibley
Brownlow	Gaines, W. Va.	McGavin	Sims
Brundidge	Garber	McKinlay, Cal.	Slemp
Burgess	Gardner, N. J.	McKinley, Ill.	Smith, Cal.
Burke, Pa.	Gilbert, Ind.	McKinney	Smith, Ill.
Burke, S. Dak.	Gillespie	McLachlan	Smith, Md.
Burleigh	Gillett, Cal.	McLain	Smith, Samuel W.
Burleson	Glass	Macon	Smith, Pa.
Burnett	Goebel	Madden	Smith, Tex.
Burton, Del.	Graff	Mann	Smyser
Butler, Pa.	Graham	Marshall	Southwick
Butler, Tenn.	Gregg	Miller	Sperry
Byrd	Grosvenor	Minor	Steenerson
Calderhead	Hale	Mondell	Sterling
Campbell, Kans.	Hamilton	Moore, Pa.	Sulloway
Campbell, Ohio	Hay	Moon, Tenn.	Sulzer
Capron	Hayes	Moore	Taylor, Ohio
Cassel	Hedge	Mudd	Thomas, Ohio
Chaney	Hefflin	Murdock	Tirrell
Chapman	Henry, Conn.	Needham	Underwood
Clark, Fla.	Henry, Tex.	Nevin	Wachter
Clark, Mo.	Hermann	Norris	Wallace
Clayton	Higgins	Olcott	Wanger
Cocks	Hill, Conn.	Olmsted	Watson
Cole	Hinschaw	Otjen	Weeks
Conner	Hogg	Overstreet	Wharton
Cooper, Pa.	Holliday	Palmer	Wiley, N. J.
Cooper, Wis.	Houston	Parker	Williams
Cousins	Howell, N. J.	Parsons	Wilson
Cromer	Howell, Utah	Patterson, S. C.	Wood, N. J.
Curtis	Humphreys, Miss.	Payne	Woodyard
Dalzell	Hunt	Perkins	Young
Darragh	James	Pollard	Zenor

Candler	Floyd	Honkins	Ransdell, La.
Flood	Garner	Murphy	
Andrus	ANSWERED "PRESENT"—17.		
Buckman	Gillett, Mass.	Kline	Page
Dale	Greene	Lever	Sparkman
Dickson, Ill.	Hardwick	Lilley, Pa.	
Finley	Hull	Mouser	
	Jenkins	Padgett	

NOT VOTING—133.

Adams, Wis.	Gilbert, Ky.	Littauer	Southall
Alexander	Gill	Little	Southard
Babcock	Goldfogle	Littlefield	Splight
Bankhead	Goulden	Livingston	Stafford
Bannon	Granger	Lorimer	Stanley
Barchfeld	Griggs	McCleary, Minn.	Stevens, Tex.
Bartholdt	Gudger	McDermott	Stevens, Minn.
Bates	Gronna	McMorran	Sullivan, Mass.
Bingham	Haskins	McNary	Sullivan, N. Y.
Bishop	Haugen	Mahon	Talbott
Blackburn	Hearst	Martin	Tawney
Bowie	Hepburn	Maynard	Taylor, Ala.
Bradley	Hill, Miss.	Meyer	Thomas, N. C.
Broussard	Hitt	Michalek	Towne
Burton, Ohio	Hoar	Morrell	Townsend
Calder	Howard	Patterson, N. C.	Trimble
Cockran	Hubbard	Patterson, Tenn.	Tyndall
Crumpacker	Huff	Pearre	Van Duzer
Currer	Hughes	Pujo	Van Winkle
Cushman	Humphrey, Wash.	Randell, Tex.	Volstead
Davidson	Jones, Va.	Reeder	Veeland
Daves	Jones, Wash.	Reid	Wadsworth
De Armond	Keifer	Reynolds	Waldo
Deemer	Kennedy, Ohio	Rives	Watkins
Dixon, Mont.	Ketcham	Roberts	Webb
Doyner	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Schneebell	Webber
Dresser	Knapp	Scroggy	Weems
Field	Knopf	Slayden	Weisse
Flack	Law	Small	Welborn
Fordney	Lawrence	Smith, Iowa	Wiley, Ala.
Fowler	Legare	Smith, Ky.	Wood, Mo.
Gardner, Mass.	Lester	Smith, Wm. Alden	
Gardner, Mich.	Lewis	Snapp	
Garrett	Lindsay		

So the Journal was approved.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

For the vote:

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin with Mr. DE ARMOND.

Mr. CRUMPACKER with Mr. WATKINS.

Mr. HEPBURN with Mr. STEPHENS of Texas.

Mr. LITTAUER with Mr. TALBOTT.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota with Mr. SPIGHT.

Mr. PEARRE with Mr. STANLEY.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa with Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts.

For the day:

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts with Mr. LIVINGSTON.

Mr. JENKINS with Mr. LESTER.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

COLLECTION DISTRICT IN THE STATE OF TEXAS.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas presents the following privileged report, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10715) to establish a collection district in the State of Texas, and for other purposes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to make the point of order that is not privileged.

The SPEAKER. In any event, the Chair supposes it would go to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PAYNE. I suppose it would.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the gentleman from New York reserves the point of order.

Mr. PAYNE. Yes; I reserve the point of order.

The SPEAKER. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

Mr. MURPHY. To a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening some time after 5 o'clock, I left this House and went to my home and shortly thereafter there appeared a deputy, I presume, or an Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms, who told me that, under the direction of the Speaker, he was ordered to arrest me and bring me before the House. He presented to me this paper, a portion of which I want to read:

FIFTY-NINTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
In the House of Representatives.

To HENRY CASSON,
Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives,

or his deputies:

Whereas clause 4 of Rule XV of the House of Representatives provides as follows.

Then it recites clause 4 of Rule XV.

And whereas the conditions specified in the said rule have arisen and the following-named persons are absent, to wit, ARTHUR P. MURPHY (and fifty-nine others who are named), now, therefore, I, J. G. CANNON, Speaker of the House of Representatives, by virtue of the power vested in me by the House, hereby command you to execute the said order of the House by taking into custody and bringing to the bar of the House the said above-named Members who are so absent; hereof fail not, and make due return in what manner you execute the same.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States this 28th day of May, 1906.

J. G. CANNON, *Speaker*.

Attest:

A. McDOWELL, *Clerk*.

With the seal of the House of Representatives thereon.

I fail to find, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, any authority whatever under law or under the rules of the House or under the Constitution for the issuance of such a paper, which purports to be a warrant. Section 5 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States provides:

Sec. 5. Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members, and a majority of each shall constitute a quorum to do business; but a smaller number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the attendance of absent Members, in such manner, and under such penalties as each House may provide.

That provides the House may do that. I find that under Rule I of the House, clause 4, in relation to the duties of the Speaker:

Sec. 4. He shall sign all acts, addresses, joint resolutions, writs, warrants, and subpoenas of, or issued by order of, the House, and decide all questions of order, subject to an appeal by any Member, on which appeal no Member shall speak more than once, unless by permission of the House.

I find in clause 3 of Rule III, in relation to the duties of the Clerk, as follows:

Attest and affix the seal of the House to all writs, warrants, and subpoenas issued by order of the House, certify to the passage of all bills and joint resolutions.

I find in Rule IV, clause 1, that the duties of the Sergeant-at-Arms are as follows:

1. It shall be the duty of the Sergeant-at-Arms to attend the House and the Committee of the Whole during their sittings, to maintain order under the direction of the Speaker or Chairman, and, pending the election of a Speaker or Speaker pro tempore, under the direction of the Clerk; execute the commands of the House, and all processes issued by authority thereof, directed to him by the Speaker.

Then I find under Rule XV, in clause 2, it provides:

2. In the absence of a quorum, fifteen Members, including the Speaker, if there is one, shall be authorized to compel the attendance of absent Members, and in all calls of the House the doors shall be closed, the names of the Members shall be called by the Clerk, and the absentees noted; and those for whom no sufficient excuse is made may, by order of majority of those present, be sent for and arrested, wherever they may be found.

Then we find in clause 4 of Rule XV—and this warrant under which the Sergeant-at-Arms was acting especially states upon its face that it was under clause 4 of Rule XV—this:

4. Whenever a quorum fails to vote on any question, and a quorum is not present and objection is made for that cause, unless the House shall adjourn, there shall be a call of the House, and the Sergeant-at-Arms shall forthwith proceed to bring in absent Members.

There is not a single provision in that rule that authorizes the Speaker of the House of Representatives to issue a warrant. There is no authority in that rule or in any other rule of this House that authorizes the Speaker of the House of Representatives to issue a warrant except upon the order of the House. Rule XV is on the subject of "Calls of the roll and House," and, under all of the rules of construction of law, all of these sections would be considered together. If you take clause 4 and construe it alone, it would be ambiguous, but, in construing ambiguity, it is not in favor of arrest, but more in the opposite direction.

I looked over the RECORD this morning, and the Journal, and there is not a single entry directing, ordering, or authorizing the Speaker of the House of Representatives to issue a warrant, a rule, an order, or any other process to bring a single Member before the bar of this House.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman sits down I would like to ask him a question. I understood you to read that warrant, and to say that you and fifty-nine other Members were out. Is that correct?

Mr. MURPHY. It is.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I believe the RECORD shows there were 160 absent.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Two hundred and sixty.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Two hundred and sixty, I am informed.

Mr. PAYNE. Four warrants.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman—

Mr. WILLIAMS. If there were that many absent Members, I do not understand why only fifty-nine were sent for.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say—

Mr. PAYNE. How does the gentleman get that information?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi to the fact that several warrants were issued.

Mr. MURPHY. I was going to call his attention to the fact that there were three or four issued.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did they all contain the same language?

Mr. MURPHY. They did, except the names.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that part of it.

Mr. MURPHY. Now, I want to call attention to the closing words of the warrant:

Now, therefore, I, J. G. CANNON, Speaker of the House of Representatives, by virtue of the power vested in me by the House.

I do not understand what authority you would get, unless it would be by a vote of the majority of the Members present.

Mr. OLMSTED. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes.

Mr. OLMSTED. I simply desire to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the rule which he had read—clause 4 of Rule XV—contemplates an arrest. That is a rule adopted by the House. It is the authorization of the House. If an arrest requires or involves the warrant of the Speaker, which would seem to be the only tangible evidence of authority the Sergeant-at-Arms could present or exhibit, the rule seems clearly to authorize the warrant, particularly when read in connection with clause 4 of Rule I and clause 1 of Rule IV.

Mr. MURPHY. Upon that I take issue with the gentleman. It provides for no warrant. The only place in the rules that it does provide for a warrant is upon authority of a majority of the Members present, and not upon the direction of the Speaker himself, in the case of arrest.

Mr. DALZELL. The propriety of arrest is determined by the manner in which the paper was written.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state, and can only do it by unanimous consent of the House, because there is nothing before the House—

Mr. PAYNE. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER (continuing). For the Chair to rule upon. Is there objection to a very brief statement by the Chair? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Chair examined with some care, and caused to be examined with some care, the propriety of issuing the warrant referred to. Clause 4 of Rule XV is a rule that was adopted in the Fifty-fourth Congress; and in the absence of a quorum, shown upon a vote taken, the rule provides what the Sergeant-at-Arms shall do. The Chair is inclined to believe that, on such a fact arising, the Sergeant-at-Arms, without a warrant, would be legally authorized, upon the order of the Speaker verbally given, as the rule provides, to bring in absent Members. Such was the old practice of Parliament. The Chair is quite well aware that no act that he performs as Representative or Speaker should be performed or can be performed properly or legally except under the Constitution, under the law, or under the rules of the House which the House adopts, not only from necessity, but by express provision.

Clause 4 was adopted, the Chair stated, in the Fifty-fourth Congress. Prior to that the House had proceeded under clause 2 of the same Rule XV, which was a provision that has dwelt in the rules, perhaps, almost from the organization of the House, but that was a proceeding for the House to get a quorum in all cases, and not especially upon the passage of a bill, as is provided for in clause 4.

Now, the gentleman from Missouri has read the authority from Rule I for the Speaker issuing subpoenas, warrants, orders, etc. There is not now, and never has been any rule, so far as the Chair can find out, that authorizes in express terms the Speaker to issue a warrant, and the Chair has caused to be examined the practice of the House under clauses 1 and 2 of Rule XV prior to the Fifty-fourth Congress and has found that uniformly on a call of the House those present gave authority in form, as follows:

Resolved, That the Sergeant-at-Arms take into custody and bring to the bar of the House such of its Members as are absent without leave.

That resolution is in substance the authority that is given by terms of the rule in cases arising under clause 4 of Rule XV, and the Chair, on inquiry, finds it was the invariable practice of substantially all the Speakers prior to the Fifty-fourth Congress on the strength of the resolution and without further authority to issue a warrant.

The Chair is still of opinion that under the practice in the House he is authorized to issue the warrant, although, as stated

before, the Chair is inclined to be of the opinion that when the fact arises under clause 4 of Rule XV the Sergeant-at-Arms, on the verbal direction of the Speaker, as that rule provides, can bring in absent Members. If he can under the verbal direction, much more he can under the written direction.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, will you pardon me—
The SPEAKER. Certainly.

Mr. MURPHY. Does clause 4 provide for the Speaker to direct it, either verbally or in writing? Can not the Sergeant-at-Arms do it without any direction?

The SPEAKER. There should be a call of the House:

4. Whenever a quorum fails to vote on any question, and a quorum is not present and objection is made for that cause—

Which was this case—

unless the House shall adjourn, there shall be a call of the House, and the Sergeant-at-Arms shall forthwith proceed to bring in absent Members, and the yeas and nays on the pending question shall at the same time be considered as ordered. The Clerk shall call the roll, and each Member as he answers to his name may vote on the pending question, and, after the roll call is completed, each Member arrested shall be brought by the Sergeant-at-Arms before the House, whereupon he shall be noted as present, discharged from arrest, and given an opportunity to vote and his vote shall be recorded.

Now—

Mr. MURPHY. That does not provide that the Speaker shall direct, or that he shall issue a warrant.

The SPEAKER. No; nor has the resolution, so far as the Chair can find, usually adopted by the House under the old rule, provided that the Speaker should issue the warrant. That authority is inferred from Rule I and other rules; but especially is derived from the old practice of the House as well as the ancient usage of the courts and Parliament.

Now, the Chair has no doubt but that under the rule and under the warrant the gentleman was legally arrested, and the question as to whether the Chair had the right to issue the warrant is a barren question, in the opinion of the Chair, because the gentleman was lawfully and legally arrested under the rules of the House without or with the warrant. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 14513) to prevent the giving of false alarms of fires in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate had excused Mr. NEWLANDS from further service as a member of the conference committee on the bill (H. R. 12707) to enable the people of Oklahoma and of the Indian Territory to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, and to enable the people of New Mexico and of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, and had appointed Mr. PATTERSON in his place.

ADJOURNMENT OVER MEMORIAL DAY.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill.

Mr. PAYNE. I ask the gentleman to yield to me for a moment.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, as to-morrow is Decoration Day and many Members of the House have requested that an adjournment be made over until Thursday, and as the business of the House seems to be in a condition to warrant it, I yield to the eminent gentleman from Ohio, a distinguished soldier, statesman, and orator, General GROSVENOR, to make the motion. [Applause.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, I suppose I ought to recognize the very high and unmerited compliment paid to me; but I desire to move, and I now do move, that when the House adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet on Thursday at 12 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio moves that when the House adjourns to-day, it adjourn to meet on Thursday next. The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 19264) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907.

The question being taken,

Mr. WILLIAMS demanded a division.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 214, nays 15, answered "present" 16, not voting 136, as follows:

YEAS—214.

Acheson	Dwight	Kinkaid	Rhodes
Adams, Pa.	Ellis	Kitchin, Claude	Richardson, Ala.
Aiken	Esch	Kiepper	Richardson, Ky.
Alexander	Fassett	Kline	Rixey
Allen, Me.	Fitzgerald	Knowland	Roberts
Allen, N. J.	Fletcher	Lacey	Robertson, La.
Babcock	Flood	Lafean	Robinson, Ark.
Bartlett	Floyd	Lamar	Ruppert
Bede	Foss	Landis, Frederick	Ryan
Bennet, N. Y.	Foster, Ind.	Lee	Samuel
Bennett, Ky.	Foster, Vt.	Le Fevre	Scott
Birdsall	French	Lilley, Conn.	Shackelford
Bonyng	Fulkerson	Lloyd	Shartel
Boutell	Fuller	Longworth	Sheppard
Bowersock	Gaines, Tenn.	Loud	Sherley
Brantley	Gaines, W. Va.	Loudenslager	Sherman
Brick	Garber	Lovering	Sibley
Broocks, Tex.	Gardner, Mass.	McCall	Sims
Brooks, Colo.	Gardner, N. J.	McCleary, Minn.	Smith, Cal.
Brown	Garner	McCreary, Pa.	Smith, Ill.
Buckman	Gilbert, Ind.	McGavin	Smith, Md.
Burgess	Gill	McKinley, Ill.	Smith, Pa.
Burke, Pa.	Gillett, Cal.	McKinney	Smyser
Burleigh	Glass	McLachlan	Snapp
Burton, Del.	Goebel	McMorran	Southwick
Burton, Ohio	Graham	Macon	Sperry
Butler, Pa.	Gregg	Mann	Spight
Butler, Tenn.	Hale	Marshall	Steenerson
Byrd	Hamilton	Miller	Stephens, Tex.
Calderhead	Hay	Minor	Sterling
Campbell, Kans.	Hayes	Moon, Pa.	Stevens, Minn.
Campbell, Ohio	Hearst	Moon, Tenn.	Sullivan, Mass.
Capron	Hedge	Moore	Sulloway
Cassel	Heflin	Morrell	Sulzer
Chaney	Henry, Conn.	Mudd	Talbott
Chapman	Hepburn	Murphy	Taylor, Ohio
Clark, Fla.	Hermann	Needham	Thomas, Ohio
Cole	Higgins	Nevin	Tirrell
Cooper, Pa.	Hill, Conn.	Norris	Townsend
Cooper, Wis.	Hinshaw	Olcott	Volstead
Cousins	Hoar	Olmsted	Wallace
Cromer	Hogg	Otjen	Wanger
Curtis	Holliday	Overstreet	Watkins
Cushman	Houston	Parker	Watson
Dalzell	Howell, Utah	Parsons	Weeks
Darragh	Hubbard	Patterson, S. C.	Wharton
Davis, Minn.	Humphrey, Wash.	Payne	Wiley, N. J.
Dawson	Hunt	Perkins	Williams
De Armond	Johnson	Pollard	Wood, N. J.
Denby	Jones, Wash.	Pou	Woodyard
Dixon, Ind.	Kahn	Prince	Young
Draper	Keifer	Rainey	Zenor
Driscoll	Keliber	Ransdell, La.	
Dunwell	Kennedy, Nebr.	Reeder	

NAYS—15.

Adamson	Burleson	Davis, W. Va.	Rhinock
Beall, Tex.	Burnett	Henry, Tex.	Smith, Tex.
Bell, Ga.	Clark, Mo.	Humphreys, Miss.	Underwood
Bowers	Clayton	James	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—16.

Andrus	Gillespie	Jenkins	Page
Brundidge	Greene	Lever	Rucker
Dale	Hardwick	Lilley, Pa.	Sparkman
Dickson, Ill.	Hull	Padgett	Wood, Mo.

NOT VOTING—136.

Adams, Wis.	Fordney	Lewis	Slayden
Ames	Fowler	Lindsay	Slomp
Bankhead	Gardner, Mich.	Littauer	Small
Bannon	Garrett	Little	Smith, Iowa
Barchfeld	Gilbert, Ky.	Littelfield	Smith, Ky.
Bartholdt	Gillett, Mass.	Livingston	Smith, Samuel W.
Bates	Goldfogle	Lorimer	Smith, Wm. Alden
Beidler	Goulden	McCarthy	Southall
Bingham	Graft	McDermott	Southard
Bishop	Granger	McKinlay, Cal.	Stafford
Blackburn	Griggs	McLain	Stanley
Bowie	Gronna	McNary	Sullivan, N. Y.
Bradley	Grosvenor	Madden	Tawney
Broussard	Gudger	Mahon	Taylor, Ala.
Brownlow	Haskins	Martin	Thomas, N. C.
Burke, S. Dak.	Haugen	Maynard	Towne
Calder	Hill, Miss.	Meyer	Trimble
Candler	Hitt	Michalek	Tyndall
Cockran	Hopkins	Mondell	Van Duzer
Cocks	Howard	Mouser	Van Winkle
Conner	Howell, N. J.	Murdoch	Vreeland
Crumpacker	Huff	Palmer	Wachter
Currier	Hughes	Patterson, N. C.	Wadsworth
Davey, La.	Jones, Va.	Patterson, Tenn.	Waldo
Davidson	Kennedy, Ohio	Pearre	Webb
Dawes	Ketcham	Powers	Weber
Deemer	Kitchin, Wm. W.	Pujo	Weems
Dixon, Mont.	Knapp	Randell, Tex.	Weisse
Dovener	Knopf	Reid	Welborn
Dresser	Lamb	Reynolds	Wiley, Ala.
Edwards	Landis, Chas. B.	Rives	Wilson
Ellerbe	Law	Rodenberg	
Field	Lawrence	Russell	
Finley	Legare	Schneebell	
Flack	Lester	Scroggy	

So the motion was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

For the balance of the day:

Mr. WILSON with Mr. SOUTHALL.

Mr. WACHTER with Mr. RUCKER.

On this vote:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa with Mr. McLAIN.

Mr. HELMANN with Mr. VAN DUZER.

Mr. CONNER with Mr. BRUNDIDGE.

Mr. BEIDLER with Mr. CANDLER.

Mr. ADAMS of Wisconsin with Mr. LAMB.

Mr. PEARRE with Mr. STANLEY.

Mr. TAWNEY with Mr. DAVEY of Louisiana.

Mr. LITTAUER with Mr. BANKHEAD.

Mr. VREELAND with Mr. ELLERBE.

Mr. CRUMPACKER with Mr. RUSSELL.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to withdraw my vote in the negative and answer "present," as I find that I am paired with the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. WACHTER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHARTON). The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. RUCKER, and he answered "present," as above recorded.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. CURTIS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SALARIES OF SECRETARIES OF EMBASSIES AND LEGATIONS.

Secretaries of embassies to Austria-Hungary, Brazil, Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Mexico, and Russia, at \$3,000 each, \$27,000.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for ten minutes, as I desire to discuss the distribution, by the appointing power, of the diplomatic and consular offices provided for in this bill between the various sections of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that he may be permitted to proceed for ten minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, for six years I was a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. During the time of my services upon that great committee my association with the distinguished gentlemen who constitute its membership was at all times thoroughly pleasant. And what I shall now say will not be directed against any action of theirs, and, of course, can in no sense be construed as a criticism of the bill now under consideration.

My intercourse and dealings with the officials of the State Department at all times during that period were just what I would have desired them to be. During all this time I did not upon any occasion ask for the appointment of any person to a diplomatic or consular position. Recently a highly esteemed constituent of mine, an accomplished German-American, asked that I present certain letters and papers to the State Department in support of an application which he had theretofore filed for an appointment as a consular officer. I did so, and while rendering this service for my Republican constituent I took advantage of the opportunity to ascertain the exact number of persons who are engaged in our diplomatic and consular service, and at the same time I also learned the number appointed from the various sections of our country. I now state, and when I have concluded my remarks I do not think there is a man on this floor who will attempt to controvert the statement, that these appointments, in so far as their distribution over our country is concerned, are inequitable, unfair, and sectional. In a monarchical form of government the diplomatic officer represents the person of his sovereign as well as the State from which he comes. In a republican form of government the diplomatic officer is the representative of his country, and is in no sense the personal representative of the Chief Executive. Such being the case I do not believe there is a man within the sound of my voice who would contend for one moment that the appointment of our diplomatic officers should not be equitably and fairly distributed between the various sections of our country.

In order to be sure that the remarks I might make on this subject would do no one an injustice and would be absolutely correct, on yesterday I asked the officials of the State Department to furnish me a detailed statement of the number of our diplomatic and consular officers and the States from which they were appointed. I have this memorandum in my hand, and what I say will be based on the data furnished by the State Department. Later I will embody it in my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, this memorandum shows that we have 96 persons representing this country abroad in the diplomatic service, and preliminary to what I have to say I desire to state that I acquit the distinguished gentleman who presides over the State Department and his very able first assistant, Mr. Bacon, who is charged with the immediate control and direction of our diplomatic officers, of any responsibility for the condition of affairs to which I now invite the attention of the House. Of the 96 diplomatic positions filled under appointment by the President of the United States we have from the State of New York 19, one-fifth of the entire number. This might strike one at first blush as a few more than that State is entitled to. Now let us see how other States fare in this particular. We have from the State of Virginia not one resident citizen in the diplomatic service, from North Carolina only 1, from South Carolina none, from Georgia none, from Florida none, from Alabama none, from Louisiana none, from Mississippi 1, from Arkansas none, from Tennessee 1, from Texas none, in all 3—11 sovereign States of this Union represented in the diplomatic service of our country by 3 persons who seem in some way to have found favor with the appointing power.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, it is customary to say that Ohio gets most of the high offices, yet Ohio with her 21 Representatives in Congress has not a single diplomatic officer.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman is mistaken; Ohio has two of her residents in the diplomatic service, and later I shall call attention to the voracious appetite of the State of Ohio when it comes to the division of the pie as represented by the consular service of our country.

Mr. GROSVENOR. If the gentleman will take the State of New York he will discover that the pie is largely centered there.

Mr. BURLESON. Oh, yes; admitted; but Ohio, when it comes to clamoring for pie, whether it be at the counter of the State Department or of any other department, Ohio is always a close second to New York, if she is not first in the van. I will give the figures before I conclude my remarks; and remember, every statement that I make I base upon the memorandum furnished me by the State Department. The 11 Southern States I have just enumerated are represented upon this floor by 98 representatives, and only three persons residing within that vast territory have been selected by this Administration to act for our country as ministers abroad; yet in the one State, New York, 19 have been thus favored.

Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to make complaint about the indecent discrimination which has been practiced against the South in this particular. We are accustomed to it, and have been for nearly a half century with only slight interruption. What I want to do is to direct attention to the unjust and unfair treatment that other sections of our country are being subjected to in the matter of appointing diplomatic and also consular officers.

Mr. KLEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman how the States mentioned awhile ago were represented under the last Democratic administration.

Mr. BURLESON. Ah, Mr. Chairman, I contend, and I now here assert, that never in the history of this Government has there been such sectionalism displayed in the selection of our diplomatic and consular officers as has been shown by the present occupant of the White House. I affirm that and I invite the gentleman from Missouri or any other gentleman upon the other side to an effort to controvert the statement.

Mr. Chairman, look to another great section of our country and see how it has fared at the hands of an Executive who has frequently expressed himself as being especially partial to that section; let us see how his words square with his acts in appointing residents of that section in our diplomatic corps. As a basis for comparison I will first direct attention to the fact that from this memorandum it is shown that from the State of Massachusetts, with the aid of her two Senators, the President has been able to find eight persons, residents of the old Bay State, who are at present acting for great America in some capacity in our diplomatic service. Now, of course we all know that Harvard University is situated in that grand old State, and no one will be so simple as to deny that that splendid institution has prepared many citizens who would reflect credit on our country when given places in our consular and diplomatic service, and it is said that a careful examination of the list will disclose that the appointing power has a keen appreciation of this fact. However this may be, Massachusetts, with the aid of her two Senators, has eight representatives acting for our country abroad. The eight Rocky Mountain States, with 16 Senators, have not been able to do quite so well. This memorandum discloses that these States have the following representatives in foreign countries acting for us as ambassadors and ministers: From Wyoming, none; from Colorado, none; from Utah, none;

from Idaho, none; from North Dakota, none; from South Dakota, none; from Nevada, none; from Montana, none.

Mr. PAYNE. I understood from the gentleman a moment ago that he looked upon this as pie, to be passed around, and he thought New York was getting too much pie. Is that the gentleman's conception of a foreign appointment for ambassador or minister—a passing around of pie?

Mr. BURLESON. Certainly not, and, Mr. Chairman, I deprecate the fact that the gentlemen who represent New York either in this end of the Capitol or the other have been so insistent in their demands upon the Chief Executive of this nation that appointments to the diplomatic service have been brought down to the low level of spoils.

Mr. PAYNE. Does the gentleman mean to insinuate that those Representatives—

Mr. BURLESON. The reason I insinuate it is because the facts justify me in the statement.

Mr. PAYNE. That those Representatives appointed from the State of New York are not fully able and capable of performing their duties?

Mr. BURLESON. Oh, no; I do not question that. I do not question and no man on this floor can truthfully take the position that there can not be found in every State of this Union an American citizen who will reflect credit upon his country as a diplomatic representative of our country abroad. That is exactly what I am protesting against now, that not only has one of the greatest sections of our country been for years persistently ignored by the powers that be, but that other sections are being unfairly and unjustly treated in the selection of our diplomatic officers. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to interruptions, but I fear my time will expire and that some one may object to an extension and I have some figures here which I want to submit to this House for its consideration. I would prefer to proceed for a few minutes without interruption. In the Central Eastern States, embracing New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and West Virginia, we have, by Executive appointment, 33 citizens who are acting abroad for our country in a diplomatic capacity, more than one-third of all the appointments he has at his disposal. From the New England States—Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and Massachusetts—we have 14 of our citizens serving us in some diplomatic capacity.

From the eleven Southern States that I have named—and to them you may add the States of Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, and Delaware—and these fifteen States furnish only ten citizens to our diplomatic service. Consider the fact that Maryland has four and Kentucky three of these, making seven of the ten, and it will be seen that thirteen States of our country are represented abroad in the person of only three American citizens, when the little State of Rhode Island alone is represented by four.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended for five minutes.

Mr. BURLESON. May I supplement that request by asking that it be made ten minutes?

Mr. MANN. Oh, let it be made for five minutes; further time will be granted if it is needed.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois that the time of the gentleman from Texas be extended for five minutes? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I have heard that the number of diplomatic representatives abroad from any particular State depends upon the measure of that State's Senatorial influence. If that is so, then the Senator from the State of Rhode Island must be indeed potential with the powers that be when he can wrest from the Chief Executive four appointments for that small State. It has four more places than the eight Rocky Mountain States have been able to secure, one more than thirteen Southern States have been given, and a number equal to the whole number given by the President to the entire Pacific slope.

I say four from the entire Pacific slope notwithstanding the fact that the memorandum furnished me would indicate that California has six, Oregon one, and Washington one. I take issue with that statement. Not that I want to be understood as saying it is not true. I feel sure it was not intended to mislead me, but I thought it was passing strange that a State so far removed as California should have six representatives in the diplomatic service of our country and the remarkable circumstance that this memorandum indicated that number excited my curiosity to such an extent that a moment ago I ran through this printed list which gives the names of all the diplomatic officers and employees and I find that three of these places are held by the same individual who represents our country as minister to

Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and Salvador, and that another is only a student interpreter in China and still another one of them, an interpreter at the legation in Peking, consequently I say that Rhode Island—little Rhode Island—and surely it must in this instance include the Providence plantation, through some potential influence has obtained as many representatives in the diplomatic service of our country as the entire Pacific slope, and all the Rocky Mountain States combined.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. Certainly; with pleasure.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman able to inform the committee what diplomatic appointments are credited to the States west of the Mississippi?

Mr. BURLESON. I will give that information to the gentleman before I conclude. Now, permit me to direct attention to how the great Middle West has fared in the distribution of diplomatic appointments. Understand, now, that the Central Eastern States and New England have between them 47 representatives in the diplomatic service, yet the great Middle West, embracing the States of Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, have—how many do you suppose? Twenty-two. Only 22, and yet we hear constant mouthings about this being one country; that our Chief Executive is the Chief Executive of the entire country; that he knows no North, no East, no West, no South. Such mouthings are mere froth, found wholly lacking in the substance of fact when the sunlight of truth is turned upon such Executive actions as these. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WATSON. May I ask the gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. Certainly.

Mr. WATSON. I want to ask my friend from Texas whether or not he believes that when the Republican party is in power that men should be selected for these foreign places from ambassadors down to consuls of the lowest classes without any reference to political affiliations?

Mr. BURLESON. Oh, no; I make and have made no such contention. Has it reached the point where the defenders of the grand old party make the confession to the country that in the great Middle West it is so poorly equipped; that in the very section from which the gentleman hails it is so poorly equipped in material to represent this country abroad that that section shall be discriminated against to the extent of giving 33 representatives in the diplomatic service to the central eastern section, 14 to the New England section, and only 22 to the great section in part represented by the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. Chairman, the course of the great Mississippi River is north and south, and it so divides our country as to throw approximately three-fifths of its area in the West. From this memorandum, furnished me by the State Department, I have ascertained that of the appointments made by the President in the diplomatic service he has given to this vast section a little less than 20 per cent of the places at his disposal, more than 80 per cent going to the section east of that great boundary. More outrageous still, if you take the territory east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio, including West Virginia and the District of Columbia, you will find that 68 of the 96 diplomatic positions have been given to persons residing within that section. I submit to any fair-minded man, can such action be justified?

Mr. LONGWORTH rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. BURLESON. With pleasure.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Does not the gentleman believe that a much worse form of discrimination than he has mentioned, either sectional or political, exists in the discrimination which is now exercised against men of moderate fortunes in all these high diplomatic posts? Under our system is it not impossible for men, no matter how able, to take these positions unless they have very large private fortunes?

Mr. BURLESON. In response to the suggestion from the distinguished gentleman from Ohio I desire to give my approval to what was said upon this floor the other day by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], that for an American citizen, if he has a mind to live simply, as the representative of a great republic should live when acting in such capacity abroad, I believe the compensation that is now allowed is adequate—is fully and thoroughly adequate to meet his requirements.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman specify whether he thinks that the compensation existing now in any of the capitols except the capitol of Mexico—

Mr. BURLESON. I understand what the gentleman has in

mind and I desire to say that I approve the suggestion he has made in reference to the United States Government owning its diplomatic residences. I think it should own them in every capitol of every first-class power in the world, and I stand ready to vote an appropriation to purchase official residences for the use of our ambassadors and ministers, but—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to abuse the patience of the committee—

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Considering the very extended general debate that has been held on this bill and a desire to finish it this afternoon, I will, with regret, have to object.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has already made that motion.

Mr. BURLESON. I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not do that, the Chair understands, except by unanimous consent. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Secretaries of legations to the Argentine Republic, China, the Netherlands and Luxemburg, and Turkey, at \$2,625 each, \$10,500.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the words "ten thousand five hundred dollars."

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present. There are not enough Members here to do business.

Mr. BURLESON. This is not coming out of my time, as I understand, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] There are 115 Members—a quorum—present.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I want to especially address myself to the distribution, made by the Executive, between the different sections of appointments of our consular officers, consequently I hurry on, but before I leave the discussion of the distribution of our diplomatic appointments I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the District of Columbia has more persons in our diplomatic service than the eleven Southern States I have named, four more than the Rocky Mountain States, and a number equal to the entire representation allowed to the Pacific slope.

Mr. OLMSTED. Does that result from the influence of the Senators from the District of Columbia?

Mr. BURLESON. "I know not, Mr. Chairman, from whence the influence comes that secured this number for the District of Columbia, but I understand that these appointments are claimed for the one "who cuts the pie."

Now, Mr. Chairman, with reference to our consular officers, we all understand that persons with imperialistic leanings might think that the diplomatic appointments are, in a measure, personal, and the Executive should be accorded the widest latitude in their selection, but every intelligent man knows that a consular officer is only the commercial agent of our country abroad—a commercial agent charged with the duty of promoting the commercial interest of the country, and charged especially—if you look in the dictionary you will see—to looking after the commercial interests of the individual citizens of that country.

Now, let me call your attention to the distribution of our consular officers, and before I proceed to do this I want to invite the attention of the committee to the fact that the 11 Southern States I have named furnish the export articles that turn the balance of trade in favor of this country. If you did not know this, or if the fact had escaped your attention, I announce it as an economic truth and invite some statistician upon this floor to controvert it if he can. And yet, in the face of this condition, which I think should be given some consideration, Mr. Chairman, we have of consular officers from the State of New York, 37; from the State of Pennsylvania, 22; from the State of New Jersey, 9; from the State of West Virginia, 6; and the States that I have named, the 11 Southern States, which have 98 Representatives upon this floor, compared with 84 Representatives from these other States, have only 14 consular officers.

Mr. MANN. How did you get so many?

Mr. BURLESON. That is one of the mysteries that ought to be explained. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that the service of each of our consular officers, regardless of the State from which he is appointed, belongs alike to all the States, but in all fairness I submit that each section is entitled to a just and fair proportion of appointments in order that we may have those in our consular service who are thoroughly familiar with the re-

sources and business interests of the various sections of our country.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I want to make one suggestion to the gentleman. Many of these diplomatic appointments are made on account of campaign contributions in each Presidential election.

Mr. BURLESON. I will permit that statement to go in my remarks, and it can be considered for what it is worth. I do not know any facts bearing upon it, although I am prepared to believe it.

Mr. KLEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman whether he knows how the Lone Star State has been treated in the appointment of consuls?

Mr. BURLESON. Yes; two consular officers have been appointed from my State.

Mr. KLEPPER. I will ask the gentleman if he knows—

Mr. BURLESON. Texas has fared very nearly as well as Missouri. The gentleman is now defending this practice of discrimination which has given the great State of Missouri out of nearly 300 consular appointments only three. And how it is, Mr. Chairman, that any man upon this floor pretending to represent the interests of his constituency can stand here and defend this system, surpasses my understanding. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to go on because I want these figures compiled from this memorandum in the RECORD.

Mr. KLEPPER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KLEPPER]?

Mr. BURLESON. I will yield with pleasure if the committee will consent to give me five minutes additional time. I ask that I may be permitted to continue from now for five minutes in addition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that he may continue his remarks for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has had ten minutes, and in addition an extension—

Mr. BURLESON. I decline to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS]. Mr. Chairman, I persist in declining to permit the gentleman by interruption to consume my time.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Then I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BURLESON. I was under the impression I had just secured additional time.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Secretary of legation to Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and San Salvador, \$2,800.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I make this motion for the purpose of calling the attention of the House of Representatives at this time to the merits and the urgent necessity for the enactment into law of my bill (H. R. 18712) "to regulate the price of mileage tickets on railway transportation companies doing an interstate-commerce business, and for other purposes," introduced by me on April 27, 1906. The bill is a very short one, and I send it to the Clerk's desk and ask to have it read in my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill to regulate the price of mileage tickets on railway transportation companies doing an interstate-commerce business, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That all railway companies doing an interstate-commerce business shall sell mileage books, good for 1,000, 2,000, 3,000, 4,000, and 5,000 miles, on their respective lines or constituent lines or connecting lines, traversing two or more States or Territories of the United States, at a price not exceeding 2 cents per mile for said mileage books, between points of destination over any railway line or branches or connecting lines of the same doing an interstate-commerce business, which said mileage books shall be good to pay for transportation between all places of destination on said railway lines, and that said mileage books shall be in the denominations hereinbefore designated, and shall be for sale by all of said railway companies at their respective offices or branch offices to any person or persons desiring to purchase the same; and said mileage books shall be good until used, and transferable by the purchaser or owner of the same; and that said mileage books shall be made out for the number of miles herein specified, namely, 1,000, 2,000, 3,000, 4,000, and 5,000 miles; and the said mileage books shall be so printed that they shall contain mileage tickets or coupons for 1 mile, 5 miles, 10 miles, 25 miles, 50 miles, and 100 miles, in order that the conductor taking up said tickets or coupons can take up the exact fare per mile, not exceeding 2 cents a mile, for the distance traveled by the passenger or passengers between destinations.

SEC. 2. That it shall be unlawful for any railway transportation company doing an interstate-commerce business to charge or collect for said mileage books more than 2 cents per mile or to give any rebate thereon; that is to say, to charge for said mileage more than 2 cents per mile, with the understanding, express or implied, that the excess over said 2 cents per mile shall be returned to the purchaser when the purchaser shall return to the railway transportation company the said mileage book with the mileage tickets therein contained used, the purpose of this act being that said railway companies doing an interstate-commerce business shall sell mileage tickets at a flat and specified rate not exceeding 2 cents per mile between all points of destination on their respective lines or branch lines or connecting lines, without any overcharge to be subsequently returned to the purchaser in the nature of a rebate.

SEC. 3. That any violation of this act by any railway transportation company doing an interstate-commerce business in and between any of the States or Territories of the United States shall be a misdemeanor, and the officers and directors of said railway transportation company guilty of the same shall be punishable by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by a fine not exceeding \$10,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court. That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed.

SEC. 4. That this act shall take effect immediately.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, the bill speaks for itself, and was introduced by me to prevent the practice now in vogue by some of the railway companies of the country of charging the purchaser of mileage-ticket books an extra \$10 for each book, with the understanding that this excess sum of \$10 is to be refunded on the return of the covers of the book. The great trunk lines of the country, as a general thing, now sell a thousand-mile ticket book, which is not interchangeable and nontransferable, for \$20, being 2 cents a mile, but they charge an excess of \$10, making \$30 in all, and withhold the \$10 until the covers of the book are returned. This is unjust and practically amounts to the taking of private property without just compensation or due process of law. There is no just warrant for this inequitable discrimination and it must be abolished.

It is generally known that the commercial travelers of the country have been fighting for years for a transferable mileage-ticket book that shall be good on all lines of railroads doing an interstate-commerce business. These commercial travelers are among our most deserving and industrious citizens. They are entitled to their rights and to fair treatment from the railroads. They are honest, earnest, sincere, and intelligent business men compelled by their occupations to travel from one end of the country to the other during all seasons of the year. They must be economical to make both ends meet. They are delightful companions and welcome always wherever they go. They are an essential part of our business and commercial life. I know them and I like them. I am now, always have been, and always will be their friend. They are entitled to our protection against unjust discriminations by the transportation corporations of the land, and we should legislate immediately to prevent further imposition on them by the railways, who take their money by these excess rates and give them nothing for it in return. I am with them in their demand for an interchangeable mileage-ticket book, to be good on all railroads, and good until used, and to be transferable from one person to another. This is only just and honest and fair, and sooner or later they will win their fight because they are right.

Now, I want to say that I am reliably informed that the Pennsylvania Railroad alone sells on an average 18,000 of these 1,000-mile ticket books every month, and charges the purchasers of them \$20 for each book, being at the rate of 2 cents a mile, and an excess of \$10, which the railroad company agrees to refund whenever the covers are returned; but often the covers of the books are lost and can not be returned, and the \$10 is a total loss to the purchaser and a clear gain to the railroad company. Whenever the railway companies sell a thousand-mile ticket book at the rate of 2 cents a mile it is simply a fair excursion or wholesale rate and a good stroke of business on the part of the railway company, because they get \$20 cash in advance, and they should not be permitted to limit the use of the ticket by unjust and unreasonable requirements nor to discriminate by an excess charge of \$10. To do so is nothing more nor less than extortion. My bill will effectually remedy this gross imposition on the traveling public, and I sincerely hope the bill will soon be reported to the House and passed. This legislation is just as important to the passengers on interstate commerce transportation corporations as the railway rate bill is to the shippers of the country, and both bills must soon become laws in the interest of the people.

The number of these mileage books sold monthly by the railroads of the country is estimated to be in the neighborhood of 50,000, and the railroads, by this excess charge of \$10 for each one of these books, takes out of the pockets of the people a sum of money without any warrant whatever equal to about \$500,000 a month, or at least \$6,000,000 a year, and the interest on this great sum, to say nothing of other losses, amounts to over \$300,000 annually. This is an outrageous imposition on the traveling public, and practically amounts to the confiscation

of their property; and I say this extortion must cease in the interest of justice and honesty and fair play to the commercial and other travelers of the country.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the bill which has just been read at the Clerk's desk, if it is enacted into law, will immediately stop and effectually end any railroad company making the purchaser of a mileage ticket book pay more for it than the actual price, and the bill provides that in no case shall the actual price be more than the rate of 2 cents per mile. It can be as much less as the railway company wants to charge. It seems to me that it would be a good business proposition for these railroads to sell these mileage books as provided by the terms of this bill. The railway statistics of the country demonstrate most conclusively that on the great trunk lines 2 cents a mile is ample compensation for railway tickets, and no railroad in the country doing an interstate-commerce business should be permitted to charge the traveling public more than 2 cents a mile. Many of the railroads, according to their own statements of their passenger earnings, can afford to carry the people to-day at a rate much less than 2 cents a mile. I believe the railroads exist for the benefit of the people and not the people for the benefit of the railroads. I would not confiscate the property of either. But, sir, whenever the railroads of the country—the great trunk lines doing an interstate-commerce business—become oppressive, unjust, and tyrannical in any particular direction it is the duty of Congress, having jurisdiction in the matter, to correct the abuse and enact necessary laws to remedy the evil.

It will be observed that my bill provides that these mileage ticket books are to be interchangeable and transferable and shall be good until used. The purchaser of one of these mileage ticket books will not sell it if he wants to use it himself, neither will he transfer it to another; and if he does not need it himself, why should he not have the right to sell it or transfer it to another or lend it to a member of his family? It is his property; he has paid for it, and paid all that it is worth, and he should be allowed to use it as he sees fit, or to dispose of it in case he has no further use for it.

The railway company loses nothing through the use of a railway mileage ticket book by some person other than the purchaser. It costs no more to transport one man than it does to carry another; and from a merely common-sense point of view it would seem to me to be good business judgment for the railway companies to promote the transfer of these mileage ticket books rather than to oppose their transfer, for the reason that the more the availability of such books is extended the more rapidly the transportation which they accommodate will be consumed. [Applause.]

Now, sir, that is all I desire to say at this inopportune time concerning this important bill. My purpose in presenting this matter to the House to-day is to get printed in the RECORD the full text of the bill and to briefly give the reasons why, in my opinion, it should speedily be enacted into law. It was necessary to do this because I am informed at the Clerk's office that copies of the bill can no longer be procured. The popular demand for copies of this bill from people all over the country has exceeded anything I have ever known before, and I have been unable to comply with half the requests I have received since the bill was introduced.

Mr. Chairman, this morning the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to whom the bill was referred, were good enough to grant me a courteous hearing on this measure. I appeared before the committee and urged an early favorable report for substantially the same reasons I have voiced here. I believe the committee will report the bill favorably at a very near day. I believe the committee is aware of the popular demand for, and the urgent necessity of legislation of this character, and I indulge the hope—shared in by so many worthy citizens—that the bill will soon be reported favorably and passed before this session of Congress adjourns. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD in connection with my remarks some data in favor of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting certain data. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Hon. WM. SULZER, M. C.

Washington, D. C.

NEW YORK, May 1, 1906.

DEAR SIR: Commercial travelers' organizations throughout the country fought for a long time for an interchangeable mileage book good on all railroads.

Commercial travelers have to travel on many railroads, and to get their transportation at 2 cents a mile they had to buy a 1,000-mile

book from each road over which they traveled, costing \$20 each, filling their pockets with books and wrapping up a good deal of money. They made a fight through their various organizations for an interchangeable mileage book to be good on all railroads. After a great struggle the Trunk Line Mileage Bureau finally concluded to sell a 1,000-mile book good on their roads for \$30, with the understanding that the extra \$10 would be refunded on return of the cover.

George W. Boyd, general passenger agent Pennsylvania Railroad Company, stated in a letter, dated February 5, 1906, to a commercial traveler friend of mine, S. M. Williams, of Pittsburg, that the Pennsylvania Railroad sells on an average of 18,000 of \$30 mileage books per month, which shows the vast number who travel and are being imposed upon by this system of mileage issued under the \$10 contract by the Trunk Line Mileage Bureau. The amount of commercial-traveler money now held by the railroads because of this is conservatively estimated to be:

Trunk Lines Association.....	\$450,000
Central Passenger Association.....	1,500,000
Pennsylvania Railroad, Pittsburg.....	350,000

Total 2,300,000

The interest on which, at current rates, would be nearly \$70,000.

When the railroad companies sell a 1,000-mile book at \$20 it is simply a fair excursion or wholesale rate, and whenever they sell a 1,000-mile book at that rate it is a good stroke of business. They get paid \$20 cash in advance. Then, why should they throw around it requirements that, in the estimation of the majority of the people who travel, are unreasonable and not required by many large railroads operating under just the same conditions as the Pennsylvania Railroad, Erie Railroad, Delaware and Lackawanna Railroad, etc.? The interchangeable mileage ticket was urgently requested by committees representing various traveling salesmen's associations, but in granting this mileage ticket these railroads tacked on the conditions regarding the \$10 excess and forfeiture of books in case of theft or loss. The Trunk Line Mileage Bureau claim they were compelled to throw these safeguards around their mileage contracts requiring a deposit of \$10, but railroads such as the New York Central, New York, New Haven and Hartford, Boston and Albany, Buffalo, Rochester and Pittsburg, and Philadelphia and Reading do not find it necessary.

I believe your bill will effectually remedy the existing evil and imposition by doing away with this \$10 excess payment, whereby thousands of dollars are withheld from the pockets of commercial travelers for the use of illegal pooling combinations.

Yours, faithfully,

WILLIAM HOGE.

NEW YORK COMMERCIAL TRAVELERS AND BUYERS' CLUB,
18 West Twenty-seventh Street, May 15, 1906.

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have noted with a great deal of interest and pleasure the efforts you are putting forth toward securing for the commercial travelers of the United States an interchangeable mileage book at a flat rate of \$20 per 1,000 miles. The traveling men of this country, who do so much toward upbuilding its commercial interests, and especially toward the prosperity and dividend-paying power of the railroads, are certainly entitled to this consideration at the hands of the railroad management.

We feel that in you we have a champion who will surely bring about some actual results so that these longed-for benefits will accrue to the commercial travelers, as we believe they so thoroughly deserve. We write this not only to pledge you our hearty support in this effort, but also to ask that you will kindly advise us as to what progress the matter is making in your hands and also as to whether there is any specific thing which we can do to further it along so that it may become an actual fact at an early date.

Again thanking you cordially for your interest and awaiting a reply at your earliest convenience, we are,

Very sincerely, yours,

COMMERCIAL TRAVELERS AND BUYERS' CLUB,
By EDWARD W. TINGUE, Secretary.

HEADQUARTERS COMMERCIAL TRAVELERS' LEAGUE,
New York, May 17, 1906.

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In behalf of the Commercial Travelers' League of the city of New York, I desire to express my sincere thanks to you for the introduction of your bill, known as "H. R. 18712." Your bill has created the proper sentiment among traveling men throughout the State, and they take pleasure in indorsing your bill in every town and hamlet where business calls them.

In the event of it being necessary for the representative of the C. T. L. to appear before the Congressional committee in charge of your bill, to urge its passage, we would be pleased to go to Washington for that purpose and have a delegation accompany us.

Thanking you for the important favor of the introduction of this bill and assuring you of our appreciation for your efforts in our behalf, we remain,

Yours, very sincerely,

FERDINAND ZIEGEL, President.

342 Manhattan avenue, City.

P. S.—Will you kindly forward to me as many copies of the bill as you can spare?

TURPENE MANUFACTURING COMPANY,
Philadelphia, May 17, 1906.

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: As a member of the T. P. A. of Pennsylvania, I wish to congratulate you upon the stand you have taken in the interest of the traveling men of this great country. Bill No. 18712 will undoubtedly prove to be one of the greatest benefits to the traveling public. Again congratulating you on the good you have done, I remain,

Very truly, yours,

ALBERT RIGGALL.

THE EAGLE WHITE LEAD COMPANY,
Philadelphia, May 17, 1906.

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I wish to congratulate you on bill 18712, which I hope will prove a success and be numbered among one of our laws.

This bill has the indorsement of myself and all the traveling men with whom I come in contact.

Very truly, yours,

T. E. BANNAN.

CINCINNATI VARNISH COMPANY,
Cincinnati, Ohio, May 17, 1906.

HON. WILLIAM SULZER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Permit me, on behalf of the T. P. A. of Pennsylvania, to thank you for the kind interest you have taken on behalf of the traveling man. At our State convention on May 5 we had the enclosed resolution unanimously passed. If there is any way in which the writer can be of any service to you, you have only to name same, and if you will drop me a line at any time I shall be only too happy to do all in my power to assist you in your good work.

I should appreciate as many copies of the bill as you could conveniently spare, as we propose to make a strong fight in all our commercial bodies looking toward the support of Pennsylvania's delegation to Congress for this bill.

Very truly, yours,

FRED. H. MACINTIRE.

[Resolution.]

Whereas Representative SULZER, Member of Congress from New York, has caused to be introduced in the House of Representatives at Washington, D. C., House bill 18712, known as the Sulzer bill: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That Pennsylvania Division, T. P. A. of A., in annual convention assembled, heartily indorse said bill and instruct its delegates to the national convention at Buffalo, to be held June next, to aid and promote its adoption by the national association; and be it

Further resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to every Member of Congress in the State of Pennsylvania, urging their support of bill No. 18712, and that every post secretary be furnished with a copy of this resolution, and the posts be asked to take action in this matter, and every member of Pennsylvania Division is urged to solicit the vote of his Congressman for this measure.

URGES TRAVELERS TO WORK FOR SULZER MILEAGE BILL—NEW YORK SILK MERCHANT CALLS RAILROADS' TREATMENT OF COMMERCIAL SALESMEN AT PRESENT UNJUST.

EDITOR NEW YORK COMMERCIAL.

SIR: I see by your paper that Representative WILLIAM SULZER has introduced a bill regulating the price of mileage tickets on railways doing an interstate-commerce business. This is a matter in which commercial travelers, buyers and their employers, as well as all other people who travel considerably on railway trains and who buy mileage books, are greatly interested.

Commercial travelers' organizations throughout the country fought for a long time for an interchangeable mileage book, good on all railroads. Commercial travelers have to travel on many railroads, and to get their transportation at 2 cents a mile they had to buy a 1,000-mile book from each road over which they traveled, costing \$20 each, filling their pockets with books and wrapping up a good deal of money. They made a fight through their various organizations for an interchangeable mileage book to be good on all railroads. After a great struggle the Trunk Line Mileage Bureau finally concluded to sell a 1,000-mile book good on their roads for \$30, with the understanding that the extra \$10 would be refunded on return of the cover.

George W. Boyd, general passenger agent of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company, stated in a letter, dated February 5, 1906, to a commercial traveler friend of mine—S. M. Williams, of Pittsburg—that the Pennsylvania sells on an average 18,000 of \$30 mileage books a month, which shows the vast number who travel and are being imposed upon by this system of mileage issued under the \$10 contract by the Trunk Line Mileage Bureau. The amount of commercial traveler money now held by the railroads because of this is conservatively estimated to be—

Trunk Lines Association.....	\$450,000
Central Passenger Association.....	1,500,000
Pennsylvania Railroad, Pittsburg.....	350,000

Total 2,300,000

The interest on this amount at current rates would be nearly \$70,000. When the railroad companies sell a 1,000-mile book at \$20, it is simply a fair excursion or wholesale rate, and whenever they sell a 1,000-mile book at that rate it is a good stroke of business; they get \$20 cash in advance. Then why should they throw around it requirements that in the estimation of the majority of the people who travel are unreasonable and not required by many large railroads operating under just the same conditions as the Pennsylvania, Erie, Lackawanna, and other roads?

The interchangeable mileage ticket was urgently requested by committees representing various traveling salesmen's associations, but in granting this mileage ticket these railroads tacked on the conditions regarding the \$10 excess, and forfeiture of books in case of theft or loss. The trunk-line mileage bureau claims it was compelled to throw these safeguards around the mileage contracts requiring a deposit of \$10, but railroads such as the New York Central, the New Haven, the Boston and Albany, the Buffalo, Rochester and Pittsburg, the Reading, do not find it necessary.

I travel selling goods, and the firm (Eastmond & Sinclair), of which I am a member, also employs commercial travelers. I am, therefore, in a position to understand how this bill of Mr. SULZER's is going to affect a great many thousands of business men. I think the traveling men's organizations all over the country ought to pass resolutions in favor of it.

NEW YORK, May 2, 1906.

A. H. EASTMOND.

[Editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer.]

TO STOP THE MILEAGE-BOOK EXTORTION.

Every Pennsylvania Congressman will be expected by his constituents to do all he can to promote the passage of the bill which has been introduced by Representative SULZER, of New York, prohibiting railroad companies engaged in interstate transportation from charging more for the mileage books issued by them than a flat 2 cents per mile rate. It is the present practice of some of the roads, and notably of the Pennsylvania, to require the deposit of \$10 on every 1,000-mile book. This deposit is returned to the purchaser upon the surrender of the covers, provided that he has not allowed the use of the book by any third party. If he has been guilty of that enormity, the deposit is liable to forfeiture. The Sulzer bill changes all that. It not only

declares that no deposit shall be exacted, but it expressly provides that mileage books shall be transferable at the option of the purchaser.

This is no more than fair and just and reasonable and right. The railroad company loses nothing through the use of a mileage book by some person other than the buyer. It costs no more to transport one man than it does to carry another, and from a merely common-sense point of view it might be supposed that the companies would be more inclined to promote the transfer of mileage books than to oppose it, for the reason that the more the availability of such books is extended the more rapidly the transportation which they cover will be consumed. The owner of a mileage book is not going to lend it to anyone else when he expects to need it himself. He will only transfer it for use during a period when it would otherwise be idle, and thus the sale of the commodity in which the carrier deals is stimulated and increased. This is too plain for argument, and it is surprising to find the companies pursuing a course which is manifestly prejudicial to their own interests.

Either they make money out of the use of mileage books or they do not. If they do not, why they should issue them at all is unaccountable, seeing that the railroads never have been accused of doing business on a philanthropic basis; but if they do, then it stands to reason that the more rapidly these books are used up the better it is for them. Possibly the explanation of this anomaly is to be found in the circumstance that there would be no excuse for the \$10 deposit extortion if the books were transferable, and there is no doubt that this extortion is the source of considerable profit. The people who buy mileage books use them all the time. As soon as one book is exhausted they purchase another, and so the company is left in possession of the deposit continuously. In the aggregate these deposits amount to a considerable sum, on which the interest is so much clear gain.

The Sulzer bill ought to be enacted into law, and as it only applies to interstate commerce, it will be the duty of the legislature at its next session to establish a flat rate of 2 cents per mile throughout the State. That will settle the mileage-book question all right.

[Editorial from the Scranton Republican.]

A MILEAGE BOOK BILL.

Representative SULZER, of New York, has introduced a bill in the House "to regulate the price of mileage ticket transportation by companies doing an interstate-commerce business, and for other purposes." It provides that all such companies "shall sell mileage books, good for 1,000, 2,000, 3,000, 4,000, and 5,000 miles, on their respective lines or connecting lines traversing two or more States of the United States, at a price not exceeding 2 cents per mile for said mileage books."

The bill further provides that such mileage books shall be good until used and shall be transferable—that is, may be lawfully sold by the purchaser, if for any reason he cares to dispose of the same to another. It also forbids any railway transportation company doing interstate-commerce business to collect for a mileage book more than 2 cents a mile or to give any rebate thereon—that is, no railway company may, as some of them are now doing, require the purchaser of a mileage book to deposit a sum largely in excess of the price of the book, the excess to be returned to him on presentation of the covers of the book after the mileage has been used.

The penalty clause of the bill provides that any violation of the act shall constitute a misdemeanor and that the officers and directors of the offending company may be punished by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by fine not exceeding \$10,000, or both if the court deems it best to punish to the limit of the law.

There are some good points about this bill. Certain railroads have given great offense to the traveling public by requiring extra deposits from all purchasers of mileage books and the abuse should be corrected. The railroads exist for the benefit of the people, not the people for the benefit of the railroads, and when the latter become too tyrannical in any particular direction it is entirely proper that Congress or any other legislative body having jurisdiction over the matter should correct the abuse by such enactments as may be necessary for that purpose.

Mr. SULZER. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON].

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can not yield his time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized. He was standing on his feet and is recognized in his own right.

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois will state his point of order.

Mr. MANN. I am perfectly willing that the gentleman shall have time to conclude his remarks, but this method of concluding remarks previously made is in violation of the rule. While I am perfectly willing to yield, and to let the gentleman have such time as he wants to speak on the subject, I am not willing that it shall be done contrary to the rules.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the point of order of the gentleman?

Mr. MANN. The point of order is that he must confine himself to the amendment. I am perfectly willing that the gentleman from Texas have such time as he says he might want. He said at first that all he wanted was ten minutes, and he has had half an hour.

Mr. BURLESON. But I submitted to interruptions.

Mr. MANN. I am not complaining about that; but let it be determined how much time he is to have. How much more time does the gentleman want?

Mr. BURLESON. About ten minutes.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Texas be extended for ten minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BURLESON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to direct

attention to the fact that these States that I have mentioned—these eleven Southern States—and you may add thereto Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, and Delaware, have 132 Representatives upon this floor. I mention that in order to indicate the population, because it will also convey to the mind approximately the amount of business transacted in that section. These States, as I have stated, have in the consular service, representing the business interests of that section in the development of their foreign trade and at the same time that of the entire United States, only 24 consular officers; and yet the District of Columbia alone has 18 of her residents in this important service. I submit now, in all candor, is there a man on the other side of this Chamber who has the effrontery to get up here and say that this is fair.

Mr. Chairman, in all the Pacific slope only eleven persons have received consular appointment, and in the eight Rocky Mountain States only ten citizens have been thus honored.

I again submit, can there be a man found in this body who will say this is equitable and just, when you consider the fact that taxes are laid upon all the people of the United States to defray the expense incurred by keeping these commercial agents abroad.

Mr. Chairman, speaking for these sections, I protest against such discrimination.

I submit that unless this is a sectional Government, unless it is the purpose of some one to favor one section of our country as against all other sections, that it is not fair that this great section with 132 Representatives on this floor should have only 24 appointees in the consular service, when the District of Columbia has 18, and when the New England States, with only 29 Representatives, have 56 appointees in the consular service of our Government. Can any man here contend that such action is not sectional?

Mr. Chairman, the Pacific Slope, furnishing her quota of products exported abroad to make up the balance of trade in our favor, has 13 Representatives upon this floor, and yet she has only 11 appointees in the consular service, two less than the States of New Hampshire and Vermont, with only four Representatives on this floor.

As I have shown, the entire Rocky Mountain region has only 10 persons in the consular service; and by way of contrast I direct attention to the fact that the stony soil and rigid climate of the Old Bay State has furnished 19 of her citizens for this service, all of whom are at present on the pay roll, enjoying the emoluments of their offices—splendid consular officers, I do not doubt, watching at all times for chances to promote the interest of the business men of that great Commonwealth and of the country.

But, Mr. Chairman, is it fair that one section of our country should in this unjust way be permitted to dominate and control the appointment of these commercial agents which have so much to do with the upbuilding of our trade with foreign countries. I charge, Sir, that this unfair discrimination against the great western section of our country is wholly indefensible. Shall the opportunity for securing a wider market for their resources in the Orient be denied to the Pacific slope and the great western section of our country? Are the business men of that section to be denied the chance to get their share of foreign trade and foreign business by an Executive who is apparently blind to their interest—who has ignored their claims to a fair proportion of the public agents who are sent abroad to foster our commercial interests?

Mr. Chairman, recently one of our consular officers died—and, by the way, it is a very rare thing that they die.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Or resign, either.

Mr. BURLESON. Or resign, either, as suggested by my friend. This gentleman who departed hence was from the State of Ohio. I invite the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, General GROSVENOR, who interrupted me a moment ago, to these facts. An effort was made, so stated by the newspapers, by the gentleman in charge of the State Department, in the person of the Secretary of State, and the Assistant Secretary of State, who, in my deliberate judgment, if they could have their way, would speedily change the unfair, unjust, and sectional practice which controls these appointments—an effort was made to appoint a Tennessean. Of course I do not know whether it was true or not, but the newspapers stated that the junior Senator from the great State of Ohio promptly put forth the claim that that place belonged to Ohio and aggressively insisted that an Ohio man be given the appointment. Mr. Chairman, has the system of spoils reached the point where these commercial agents, who should be carefully selected so as to conserve the business interest of every section of our country, are now set apart to certain States, to be doled out to them year after year in total disregard of the interests of the other

sections of our country? That is a question that each man here in his own conscience can answer for himself.

Mr. Chairman, east of the Mississippi River we have 240 persons who are holding positions abroad in our consular service, while the great stretch of our country west of the Father of Waters furnishes only 54 citizens who have received consular appointments. In that section of our country east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio, including West Virginia and the District of Columbia, 223 places have been given, leaving remaining for all other sections only 71 appointments.

I now desire to direct attention to the fact that the Central Eastern States have 74 citizens in the consular service, and the great Middle West, in part represented by my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. MANN], with 102 Representatives upon this floor, has only 91 citizens in the consular service.

Mr. MANN. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. BURLESON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I think there have been several appointments to the consular service made from my district since I have been in Congress, but who got them I do not know, and I am very sure they were not made on political influence, and I do not believe on merit. [Laughter.]

Mr. BURLESON. If the appointments were not made on merit nor because of political influence, for conscience sake tell me the source of the influence that brought about their selection.

Mr. MANN. That is a mystery that never has been solved.

Mr. BURLESON. I agree with the gentleman that it is a mystery, but no deeper or more unfathomable than the reasons for the contention of certain people in this country for asserting that we have at the head of our Government a nonsectional Executive, when, in the light of the facts I have detailed, any candid, honest, fair-minded man must inevitably be driven to the conclusion that he has been not only partisan but sectional in naming the diplomatic and consular officers of our country.

Mr. Chairman, if it is too much to expect an abandonment of the indecent discrimination which has been practiced against the South for so many years, and I suppose it is, is it too much to hope that the unfair discrimination against the Pacific slope and the Middle West, and the unjust and indefensible discrimination now being practiced against the Rocky Mountain States will soon be brought to an end?

Mr. Chairman, in the recent past certain investigations of the business methods which have obtained in the conduct of the affairs of our great insurance and railroad corporations disclosed conditions highly discreditable to those in charge, if it did not prove them to be actually dishonest and violators of the law.

As a result of these investigations and disclosures the public conscience has been quickened, and there is a promise of a return of those higher standards of business probity which characterized the fathers in their dealings and transactions with each other. Is it too much to hope that, having directed attention to the gross discriminations which have been practiced against other sections of our country in addition to the South in the appointment of diplomatic and consular officers, that there will result at least a measure of correction for this persistent wrong which has been and is now being done the commercial interests of those sections?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. I submit the memorandum upon which I have based my remarks.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 28, 1906.

Hon. A. S. BURLESON,
United States House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to inclose a memorandum in compliance with your telephonic request of to-day.

Respectfully,

ROBERT BACON,
Assistant Secretary.

[Memorandum.]

Number of diplomatic and consular appointments from each State, as shown by the Diplomatic and Consular List.

State.	Diplo- matic.	Con- sular.	State.	Diplo- matic.	Con- sular.
Arizona		1	Kansas	1	3
California	6	8	Kentucky	3	3
Connecticut		10	Louisiana	2	2
Delaware		1	Maine	1	9
District of Columbia	4	18	Maryland	4	3
Florida		2	Massachusetts	8	19
Idaho		1	Michigan	3	9
Illinois	7	17	Minnesota	3	7
Indiana	2	11	Mississippi	1	
Iowa	3	9	Missouri		3

Number of diplomatic and consular appointments, etc.—Continued.

State.	Diplo- matic.	Con- sular.	State.	Diplo- matic.	Con- sular.
Montana		1	South Dakota		4
Nebraska	2	6	Tennessee	1	3
New Hampshire	1	6	Texas		2
New Jersey	4	9	Utah		1
New York	19	37	Vermont		1
North Carolina	1	3	Virginia		1
North Dakota		3	Washington	1	1
Ohio	2	28	West Virginia	2	6
Oregon	1	2	Wisconsin		10
Pennsylvania	9	22			
Rhode Island	4	5	Total	96	234
South Carolina		1			

The Clerk read as follows:

Secretary of legation to Siam and consul-general at Bangkok, \$2,000.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I should like to inquire if the Clerk has read section 2, on page 4?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has just read lines 6 and 7, on page 4.

Mr. SCOTT. I did not hear the second paragraph on that page, beginning with line 3, read by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. That was read before the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] was recognized.

Mr. SCOTT. I ask unanimous consent to return to that section for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman what his amendment is?

Mr. SCOTT. The amendment which I desire to offer is to insert after the word "to" the word "Liberia;" and if that amendment is agreed to then I want, in order to make the bill consistent, to return to the preceding section to strike out "Liberia," the purpose of my amendment being to increase the salary of the secretary of legation at Liberia from \$2,000 to \$2,800.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I shall have to object, because that item was very carefully considered by the committee after several hearings from interested parties, and I should not be carrying out the judgment or will of the committee if I permitted a return to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made, and the Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

For ten student interpreters at the legation to China, who shall be citizens of the United States, and whose duty it shall be to study the Chinese language with a view to supplying interpreters to the legations and consulates in China, at \$1,000 each, \$10,000: *Provided*, That said student interpreters shall be chosen in such manner as will make the selections nonpartisan: *And provided further*, That upon receiving such appointment each student interpreter shall sign an agreement to continue in the service as interpreter to the legations and consulates in China so long as his said services may be required within a period of ten years.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on this section. I wish some information from the gentleman in charge of the bill about these interpreters. How many are there? What good do they do? Why this expenditure of money?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. SULZER. I reserved the point of order.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. There is no change in the existing law.

Mr. SULZER. How many of these interpreters are there there, and what are they for?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. The whole number.

Mr. SULZER. That is an intelligent answer. How long have they been there?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Ever since the act was passed.

Mr. SULZER. When was the act passed?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. That I can not tell the gentleman. It was the old provision in the act and has been there for a good many years.

Mr. SULZER. Well, these interpreters must have long gray beards by this time. [Laughter.]

Mr. COUSINS. I will say to the gentleman that ten of them were commissioned, some in 1902 and some in 1903.

Mr. SULZER. Have they been there all this time?

Mr. COUSINS. Yes; some are now vice or deputy consuls.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I will explain that the obligation rests upon the students to remain in the service ten years in consideration of the education they receive. After that they are free to go, and as they pass out their places are filled by new applicants.

Mr. SULZER. What is the object of having these interpreters?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. There are so few Americans speak the Chinese language that these students are there for the purpose of learning the language, and they aid the consuls in developing the trade of our country.

Mr. SULZER. Is it for the purpose of letting down the barriers put up against the Chinese to keep them from coming in here?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. We have no barrier against the Chinese, except what is agreed to by the Chinese treaty—that is, against the coolies, to keep them out. Under the law to-day the other Chinese are admitted—bankers, students, travelers, etc.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw his point of order?

Mr. SULZER. I would like to have some more information. Thus far I have received little on the subject. Who appoints these interpreters?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. The President of the United States. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Chair rule on the point of order.

Mr. SULZER. I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Chairman, but I would like to get a little more information. How does the President appoint them? It says here that they shall be nonpartisan; what does that mean?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. It means that they shall be selected from likely young men who have ability or some talent for languages, and shall be chosen for nonpartisan purposes.

Mr. SULZER. How much pay do they get?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. One thousand dollars a year.

Mr. SULZER. So we have been expending \$10,000 a year for a dozen years or more for these ten interpreters—an unnecessary waste of money, in my opinion.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Now, I ask for a ruling by the Chair.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This is a queer provision, it seems to me, to be in this bill. Why should we pay \$10,000 a year for the purpose of sending ten young men over to China to learn the Chinese language, when, as a matter of fact, these young men may live in China all their lives and not be able to learn the Chinese alphabet? What service are they to this country?

Mr. MANN. Does it take that long to learn it?

Mr. SULZER. Very few Chinamen know their own alphabet, and I doubt if these young men know much about it. [Laughter.] It seems to me this is a waste of the public money. This is an era of strict economy, especially in regard to matters at home.

Here are \$10,000 being thrown away every year on ten young men over in China, whose names we know not. Perhaps they are sent there to have a good time. I don't see any sense in it, I do not see any good in it, I do not see any return that it is going to bring to the Government, and the provision ought to be stricken out and thus save to the taxpayers of this country this \$10,000 every year. Quite an item. I undertake to say that if the taxpayers knew about this waste, they would rise up and object. Oh, yes; the Republicans laugh; they always do when they are spending the people's money without giving any reason for it. I undertake to say that this provision of \$10,000 a year can do no possible good to anybody except, perhaps, these ten young men, and we do not know one of them. [Laughter.]

I would like to know who they are. Perhaps the gentleman from Pennsylvania knows who they are. My friend from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] a little while ago made an eloquent speech regarding the injustice and discriminations in diplomatic and consular appointments, and here are ten diplomatic appointments that some member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs ought to shed a little light upon. They are ten little \$1,000 a year sinecures. A little pap to some ten little favorites. We should stop, or at least know more about it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For two clerks at the embassy to Great Britain; one at the rate of \$1,800 per annum, and one at the rate of \$1,200 per annum, \$3,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the point of order, I would like to have an explanation of this. What new thing has occurred to make it necessary to have two more clerks at the embassy at Great Britain?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I will state in reply to the gentleman that the Secretary of State appeared before our committee and urged this increase in the clerical force at the embassy at London for the following reason: The Secretary proposes to introduce a new scheme for gathering and

disseminating knowledge among the various diplomatic posts abroad. There has not been sufficient intercommunication between the several embassies and legations to keep them informed of all that is going on at the different posts so that they may have a general knowledge of all negotiations and all doings carried on. The scheme as submitted to the committee by the Secretary of State was this: When instructions are sent out now to our various ministers and ambassadors it takes a great number of cablegrams in order to reach them all. This proposition is to send one cablegram with instructions to London and then to have those instructions transmitted by post to the various representatives, which would cost very much less, as nearly every embassy and legation is within twenty-four hours, mail time, of London. The House can readily see that this will be a saving as well as an influence in distributing knowledge.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the point of order. I see in one place in the bill, on page 6, a lump sum for clerks in embassies and legations. I would like to know of the gentleman the necessity for making a specific appropriation for clerks at London when a lump sum covers precisely the same thing?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I will state that, as this is new legislation and put in for a specific purpose, it could hardly come under the head of the general appropriation for clerk hire which is distributed, in the discretion of the Secretary of State, to all the different posts. The Secretary was frank to submit his scheme to the committee. It met with universal approval, and the necessity for these clerks at the embassy at London is for the increased work that will be put upon that embassy in the gathering and distribution of this information. Hence the necessity for the separate item.

Mr. MANN. Under the original item in the bill, on page 6, the Secretary can employ as many clerks as he pleases, at such salaries as he pleases to pay, provided he does not exceed the sum of \$65,000. I really do not see the point of making a specific appropriation for two clerks, segregating those from the original number included in the \$65,000. I have no objection to the item.

Mr. FLOOD. These two clerks represent the State Department, and are not to do any of the work of the embassy at London. They represent the State Department for the purpose of sending out this information by mail.

Mr. MANN. There is nothing in the bill to that effect at all. This is for clerks at the embassy, and nothing is said about the State Department. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 18, after the word "dollars," insert "That the consular agency at Cardenas, Cuba, be raised to a consulate, at \$1,500 per annum."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on that amendment.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will not do that. I have offered this to a very vulnerable paragraph in this bill.

Mr. MANN. Not now. It is not vulnerable now.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Why not?

Mr. MANN. Because it has been discussed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill if he will make any additional appropriation or give the consul a better office or headquarters in London than he has had heretofore?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. We increase the clerk hire, their allowance for clerk hire, because the salary of the consul has been cut in half under the bill that passed the House a few days ago.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Who is consul there now?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. General Wynne.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I do not know so much about the salaries for the clerks, nor do I know how many clerks they have. My recollection is that all the clerks were employed for which there was room in which to work, and the purpose of my saying anything here just now is this: I think it is a perfect shame that we have a trifling little box of an office for the use of this our London consul. It is a little bit of a concern, I dare say the gentleman has seen it. It is enough almost to make

an American citizen pull his hat down at least a little bit over his face when he looks at it. When Consular-General Evans was there he and I talked about it. He was our former consul, and he said that he did not have room in which to work. I do not know about the clerk hire or about the number of clerks, but I do think that the committee ought to look into the matter further, and if they have not provided for a better office at that place it should be done.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. They have looked into it, and I will say, under the bill for the reorganization of the consular service, London will get an increase, and we have also allowed an increase in this bill. I quite agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will that enlarge the office any; I mean the little box in which they at present work?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I believe the more rent allowance you have the bigger place you can rent.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I hope we will have a better place, for while Mr. Evans was consul there I saw a lot of American women, some from my own State, some from Pennsylvania, and our people from all over the United States, who went there to call on the consul on business, and there was often not room enough for them all to get in to wait their turn, and part of them were hanging around the door, all waiting for an audience with the consul.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I quite agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. It is a shame this office should be in that fix.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, FOREIGN MISSIONS.

To enable the President to provide, at the public expense, all such stationery, blanks, records, and other books, seals, presses, flags, and signs as he shall think necessary for the several embassies and legations in the transaction of their business, and also for rent, postage, telegrams, furniture, messenger service, compensation of kavasses, guards, dragomans, and porters, including compensation of interpreter, guards, and Arabic clerk at the consulate at Tangiers, and the compensation of dispatch agents at London, New York, and San Francisco, and for traveling and miscellaneous expenses of embassies and legations, and for printing in the Department of State, and for loss on bills of exchange to and from embassies and legations, \$225,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, there is an increase in this item of \$67,500. I reserve the point of order to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi reserves the point of order.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I would like to be heard on that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I reserve the point of order for the present that the gentleman may explain. I desire the gentleman to explain the necessity for this increase of \$67,500. I reserve the point of order in order that he may do so in the meanwhile. If his explanation is satisfactory, I may withdraw it.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I will state for the information of the gentleman, in the first place, the increase is \$35,000. Last year it was \$190,000. This year it is \$225,000, which makes an increase of \$35,000.

Mr. FLOOD. Can I interrupt the gentleman for a moment?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Certainly.

Mr. FLOOD. The amount last year was \$190,000?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I so stated.

Mr. FLOOD. But out of that was supposed to be taken about \$32,500 for clerk hire. Now, there has been a specific appropriation for clerk hire, so that does not come out, and that \$32,000 will have to be added to this \$35,000, making the increase \$67,500.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I will further say to the gentleman that we have put a provision in this bill allowing transportation at 5 cents a mile, which will have to come out of the contingent fund for the transportation of diplomatic officers to their posts, and that will use a great deal of it. I will also state that there was a deficit last year of nearly \$30,000 in the contingent fund, and the Committee on Appropriations have served notice on the Departments that this habit which has grown up between the Departments and Congress of putting in estimates below what they know their cost is going to be and then coming in annually with the deficit has got to cease, and we have raised the appropriations in these bills, allowing for the deficiencies of last year and adding that to be somewhere near the actual expenses of the Department. Furthermore, the gentleman must realize that as our intercourse with other nations extends and as business increases the expenses of all representatives abroad, both consular and diplomatic, also increase.

Furthermore, the cost of clerk hire abroad is increasing all the time, and under those circumstances, when the Department asked for \$340,000, we thought we had cut them down and held them in very well. After careful hearing of the Secretary of

State we had the fiscal agent of the Department before the committee, and we had the head of the Consular Bureau and gave them all careful hearings. I have never known, since I have served on the committee, the Secretary of State to come before the committee before. It has always been considered, perhaps, a little below the dignity of the high office, but so earnest is the present Secretary to reform our foreign service and to make it efficient in every way that he laid aside whatever great dignity may attach to his office and came before us in full, frank, and free conference, as did the other officers of the Department. And so convincing were their statements in what they urged that the committee unanimously agreed on the sum mentioned here as a fair one.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, there was last year provided out of this contingent fund \$32,500 to be paid for clerks. Clerks were paid out of it. This year the clerks are put upon salaries specifically provided for in the balance of the bill, so that instead of there being an increase in this fund there ought to have been a decrease. In addition to that, not long ago, I do not remember how long ago, but I believe it was at this Congress—it may have been at the last Congress—we passed a bill here providing certain traveling consuls who would act as inspectors. Now, all that inspecting work hitherto had been done out of this fund. That is another reason why this fund might have been decreased instead of being increased.

Now, counting the \$32,500 that used to be paid out of it for clerk hire—and that will not now have to be paid out of it—and the absolute increase of \$35,000, there is an increase of \$67,500 upon an original basis of \$190,000—the total appropriation for the last fiscal year.

As to the promise that hereafter there shall be no deficit, of course those of us who do not believe in Santa Claus as a real, living, visiting sort of an entity, do not take much stock in that. The House has been trying for a long time to get executive officers to keep within the limit of the amounts of appropriations for definite purposes made by the legislative branch of the Government. They have not done it, and they are not going to do it after this. They come in very frequently and get an increase here and there upon the plea that their deficit thereafter will not be so great, but in my experience here I have never found the deficits thereafter were less than they were theretofore. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the increase ought to be made, and for that reason, and not merely because I can make the point of order, I shall insist upon the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I was going to ask the gentleman if he had fully considered the necessity of an increase of the amount so as to provide more kavasses.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. What is a kavass?

Mr. MANN. I understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the cost of cablegrams will be less, but I apprehend that the reason this is increased sixty or seventy thousand dollars is in order to provide additional compensation for kavasses.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I will state to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that kavasses come very high.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Telegrams are decreased and inspecting services decreased, and I reckon it must go to kavasses or dragomans—one or the other.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. A kavass is a messenger.

Mr. WILLIAMS. A sort of a man—the same as a dragoman. One interprets and guides and the other just messengers.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. In reply to the gentleman I would like to read from the letter of the Secretary of State, addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury, relating to the contingent expenses of foreign missions in consulates, in which he says:

Owing to the peculiar nature of the foreign service it is impracticable to fix or apportion the amount to be used by embassies, legations, and consulates and adhere to such apportionment for the reason that the cost of telegrams, charges for postage, and other items can not be regulated.

Rents are increasing annually. It is observed that increased rates are made for lights and fuel. Increased wages are demanded for clerical, messenger, and janitor service. The demands on the Department for furniture, typewriters, carpets, stoves, fixtures, etc., for embassies, legations, and consulates can not be estimated. Unforeseen emergencies, which the Department can not control, are constantly arising in the foreign service which necessitate the immediate expenditure of large sums of money.

I would state, for the information of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], that the service in the consular service to-day is practically paralyzed for the reason that the contingent fund is exhausted, and that they have not the money with which to pay postage on their letters, and if they wish to make reports which the Department demands shall be made in regard to our foreign commerce it must be done out of their

own pocket. I do not wish to repeat, but, as I said before, as the country grows and as our trade expands so do the expenses of our foreign department expand. And for this reason we must expect the contingent expenses to grow from year to year. And it will be a very mistaken policy, Mr. Chairman, if any lack of liberality is extended to this most important branch of the service, for when you think of it there is but \$2,000,000 a year expended on this great department of our Government which holds in its hands almost war or peace, and which protects our citizens abroad from injury and recovers damages for such injuries, and which at the end of the Boxer rebellion in China got \$20,000,000 damages for injury to our citizens there. Think of a department recovering \$20,000,000 at a cost of \$2,000,000 a year to run it.

The money is expended by the State Department, affecting the very life and welfare of our country; and when we think of the able men of our country who, in a spirit of patriotism, are willing to go abroad and not receive adequate compensation for their services—not only that, but do not receive money upon which to live in the manner which is imposed upon them—when we know these facts, it seems to me a mistaken policy to undertake to cut down the small contingent fund which is intended to meet the various expenditures that are necessarily incurred in the running of this efficient and important department of our Government. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to hear from the gentleman from Mississippi on the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The point of order is that it is a change of existing law, not a limitation, and is new legislation to the extent of the increase.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I would like to submit this statement: The contingent fund is necessarily a continuing appropriation from year to year to meet the necessities of the State Department. It can not be limited, for its very name "contingent" implies that it can not be absolutely estimated. Therefore the very fact of it, and its necessity from year to year, implies a change of amount and is not a change of the existing law, for the law consists in the appropriation that establishes a contingent fund, and the amount is to be made in accordance with the estimates that are furnished by the Department.

The CHAIRMAN. If the point made by the gentleman from Mississippi wholly applies to the increase in the amount, the Chair will overrule the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The point of order necessarily is applied to all of it that is not specifically set forth. The point is made to all the paragraph, because the increase makes it new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order. The Clerk read as follows:

STEAM LAUNCH FOR LEGATION AT CONSTANTINOPLE.

Hiring of steam launch for use of the legation at Constantinople, \$1,800.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against this provision.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state his point of order?

Mr. SULZER. I think it is new legislation.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. It is not new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state his point of order?

Mr. SULZER. I want to know the warrant of law for this appropriation—the authority for paying \$1,800 a year rent for a steam launch for the legation at Constantinople?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. It is the same as last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. SULZER. Not so fast; but very well; then I move to strike out the last word. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I can find no warrant of law for this continuing appropriation, to hire a steam launch for the legation at Constantinople, and to pay every year for this steam launch \$1,800 rental. You can buy a pretty good steam launch for \$1,800; and to-day, according to the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, we have been paying from year to year without any warrant of law whatever \$1,800 in rent for a steam launch. I would like to ask the gentleman, if he knows, how long we have been paying this?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I do not know.

Mr. SULZER. You ought to know, being the chairman of the committee. [Laughter.]

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I will simply say to the gentleman that I know enough to knock out the point of order; and being in charge of the bill, it is not necessary to know any more.

Mr. SULZER. That is not clever. The Chairman overruled the point of order, and he did so in error, without any more au-

thority for it than you had to put in this bill this grafting appropriation of \$1,800 a year rental for a launch.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. SULZER. It looks queer to me. I would like, if the gentleman can give the information, to know how long this steam launch renting of \$1,800 a year has been going on?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I do not know how old the boat is, but I know that it was passed the first time in 1892, and it has existed there ever since. I suppose the gentleman knows that this is on the Bosphorus, and a steam launch is necessary to visit the incoming vessels.

Mr. SULZER. Then we have paid twenty-odd thousand dollars rent for the use of this steam launch. Quite an item.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. It is not owned by the Government.

Mr. SULZER. I said we paid that in rent. We could buy a steam launch for something like \$2,000. We can buy a pretty good steam launch for \$2,000. I know where there are new steam launches for sale at that price, and they are very fine launches. They last for twenty or thirty years. I would like to know why we do not buy a launch?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, if we had an item in this bill for the purchase of a steam launch, and the gentleman had the economic turn of mind he has now, I would like to know what he would do with that?

Mr. SULZER. A launch, if necessary, should have been bought in the first instance. It is economy to do it now.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I was not here in 1892, or probably I would have suggested buying a boat at that time.

Mr. SULZER. Now, think of that going on, Mr. Chairman, for the next twenty or thirty years paying out every year \$1,800 for the rent of a steam launch. It seems to me to be a great waste of money. It seems to me that it is poor economy. Why, instead of hiring a launch, we ought to buy one. It certainly seems to me to be extortionate to pay \$1,800 a year rent for a little steam launch. Something must be wrong with such a system of administration. It should be looked into, I think, just a bit. In my opinion money can be saved here, and if it can it is our duty to save it for the taxpayers. I understand that things are very cheap in Constantinople. In my judgment, \$800 a year would be plenty of money to appropriate for hiring a steam launch to sail out on a hot evening over the Bosphorus. It seems to me the gentleman from Pennsylvania, chairman of the committee, ought to have investigated this matter a little. He made up this bill apparently according to any old way. So I move to amend by striking out "eighteen hundred dollars" and inserting "eight hundred dollars," thus saving the taxpayers of the country \$1,000 every year.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to amend by striking out the words "one thousand."

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. SULZER. Division. Let us stand up for economy.

The committee divided; and there were—yeas 10, yeas 62.

Mr. SULZER. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I regret to note the absence of a quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-five—a quorum present.

Mr. SULZER. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were refused, 19 Members, not a sufficient number, rising in support of the demand.

The Clerk read as follows:

GROUND RENT OF LEGATION AT TOKYO, JAPAN.

Annual ground rent of the legation at Tokyo, Japan, for the year ending March 15, 1907, \$250, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert a new section after line 16, page 9:

"For the acquisition in foreign capitals of proper sites and buildings for the embassies and legations of the United States and for the residences of the ambassadors and envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary of the United States to foreign countries, \$1,000,000."

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order against that amendment.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I have already addressed this House laboriously, lengthily, and, I fear, somewhat boringly upon this subject upon two previous occasions. I would not, if I could under the rules, take up any long time in the discussion of this question now. I desire merely to say that there is a bill in this House which has the unanimous approval of all the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, including its acting chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS], appropriating for this purpose the sum of \$5,000,000. I have simply taken from that bill \$1,000,000 and propose it as an

amendment to this appropriation bill. If we pass this amendment, we will then be taking the first step to relieve the condition under which this Government is now laboring, of being represented at every great embassy and every great mission in Europe and in the Far East by men whose necessary qualification is that they have the price.

Mr. RUCKER. What does the gentleman mean by that? Does he mean that they have paid a price?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Oh, certainly not. I mean what everybody knows is true, that under our system no one can accept an important diplomatic position under our Government unless he has a large private fortune to enable him to meet his expenses abroad.

Mr. RUCKER. I should like to ask the gentleman, does he think that under present conditions there is the slightest chance on earth for a poor man ever to get one of these places?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do not think it is conceivable.

Mr. RUCKER. Even although your amendment should be adopted, would there still be any chance?

Mr. LONGWORTH. The adoption of my amendment would not absolutely relieve the condition, but it would, however, serve notice that this Congress is going to consider the question of ameliorating this condition of affairs.

Mr. RUCKER. Would it not simply serve notice that Congress was going to pour a little more wealth into the laps of rich men?

Mr. LONGWORTH. On the contrary this money would be expended by the Government to provide residences abroad where poor men appointed to these positions could live.

Mr. RUCKER. Where a poor man could live, but where rich men will continue to live until we get a change in this country.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Where a rich man must of necessity live if appointed, and therefore be on the same basis as a poor man appointed there. At present the amount which an ambassador pays for his official residence is limited only by what he is willing to pay out of his own private means.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I fully appreciate what the gentleman has stated, from a historical standpoint, and I dare say he has given the matter a thorough investigation. Will he tell the committee whether or not our ministers previous to the civil war, were rich men, or when this rich-man era began? I ask the question seriously, because I want to know.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee that it has certainly been in existence since 1892, when we passed the act elevating our ministers to be ambassadors. I think it was in existence long before that, certainly in London and the great European posts.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Did our ministers, ambassadors, and foreign officers forty years ago have to be millionaires to serve the Government?

Mr. LONGWORTH. No; they did not.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. What has brought about the changed conditions?

Mr. LONGWORTH. The fact that they are now ambassadors in some cases has brought about a changed condition. The fact that the cost of living has largely increased is also another element, and, above all, the fact that this country has now a position in the world's politics hardly dreamed of by our statesmen forty years ago.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The gentleman must know that our foreign officials in years past had, through their ability—

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I will answer the gentleman. The original act of Congress, when Benjamin Franklin was sent abroad, gave him unlimited means to live in a style proper to represent the country. After that, before these salaries were fixed, our ministers when they went abroad were given large sums for an outfit.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Well, the gentleman has cited one case.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended ten minutes.

Mr. MANN. Five minutes at a time, Mr. Chairman; I object to ten minutes.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. The gentleman is talking about a very important matter.

Mr. MANN. We have discussed this matter several times, and we want to get through with this bill some time. I ask that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks that the time of the gentleman from Ohio be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to recite

any particular date that occurred so long ago as the gentleman from Tennessee can remember but which I can not. [Laughter.] But, under our system, frequently men of great distinction from this country have been submitted to great humiliation from the way they were compelled to live in comparison with the way that representatives from other countries of the same position were living. The fact is that to-day in no great European capital can a proper residence be acquired for at least the amount that is paid to our ambassadors in salaries. If this country adopts the system of owning residences which shall be used, which must be used, by our ambassadors and ministers, then immediately this condition, under which men of wealth going to represent us abroad vie with each other in lavishness of expenditure of their immense wealth, will disappear. I would like to call the attention of this House to the fact that the act which raised our ministers to the rank of ambassadors was subject to a point of order, because it was an amendment to this bill. The point of order was not raised here or in the Senate; it was passed unanimously. Just before that act passed the Secretary of State refused to recommend that our ministers should be raised to the rank of ambassadors unless Congress would in some way, directly or indirectly, increase their compensation. Congress proceeded to do by unanimous consent exactly what the Secretary of State recommended should not be done.

It seems to me that the gentleman from Pennsylvania might very well withhold his point of order. It is impossible in this session of Congress to secure consideration of this bill. I will say that I had intended, if this bill could have been considered, to have amended it so that the Secretary of State should be authorized to expend an amount not to exceed \$1,000,000 a year for five years. I believe that this appropriation for suitable residence—and I do not advocate the buying of a palace or anything except the sort of a house that the gentleman from Mississippi would say was proper for a gentleman to live in representing this country—would bring about a condition under which our representatives could be chosen on account of their learning and ability and intellectual fitness, regardless of what their worldly possessions may be. It seems to me the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is in sympathy with this bill, might very well withhold the point of order upon this amendment.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, the reserving of a point of order to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio illustrates the absurd rules that prevail in this House in regard to legislation. Only committees can legislate. Now, the vast majority of this House is in favor of some such provision as that contained in the bill that has been offered by the gentleman from Ohio and favorably reported by this very committee, and yet under a rule that has absolutely destroyed the value of the individual Member this amendment, embodying the principle of that bill, will be ruled out. No amendment can be offered to any legislation, no matter how germane it may be to the subject, if it be not absolutely within a narrow rule that we have created, and the result has been that the House of Representatives has lost its influence and its power. But I do not want to discuss rules. I want to speak to the merits of the amendment. I favor the amendment not only because I believe that we ought to have homes for our legations abroad, but because I believe it would do something to stop the shameful extravagance, the outrageous and un-American method of living of some of our representatives abroad.

I think that when a representative of America pays \$40,000 for his house rent in London, and several times that in maintaining it, he is not representing but misrepresenting the country that honors him. Of all men in the world, I have the most supreme contempt for that man who would pander to the poor by an abuse of the rich. There is not in my whole make-up one single bit of envy of any man because of his wealth. I submit, however, to this House that the extravagant living which has been indulged in by some of our representatives abroad is un-American; that it does not represent the spirit of the Republic; that it does not represent the best life of the people of this Republic.

The American people believe in good living. They believe in decent living; but they do not believe in all the ostentation which has been indulged in in recent years, and the wrong is not only a wrong while a man is in office, but it is a continuing wrong that involves every man who follows him at that particular post. Every man succeeding one of these men who spends thousands and thousands of dollars in a show of their wealth is expected to carry on the same establishment, equally large, to make the same expenditure, and the result is that instead of American legations representing the democracy for which our country stands they represent as much of aristocracy, as much

of exclusion, as much of vulgar display of recently acquired wealth as can be found the world over. [Applause.] For that reason I hope to see the amendment adopted or some similar legislation had. If we had men whose wealth had been of a little longer standing, there would perhaps be less display of it. No man can justify an expenditure for the maintaining of an establishment such as we have seen in two or three capitals in Europe as being necessary to uphold the dignity of the office. There is a dignity that demands a proper dwelling place; that demands a decent living; an ability to entertain properly the representatives of other governments and American citizens who may be abroad; but that dignity is violated the moment you step across the line of refinement into unseemly display and ostentation, and no worse example of it can be given to the people of America than this display of wealth that has resulted in a man having to be a multimillionaire, or some member of his family being one, in order for him to accept the post at the Court of St. James, at Paris, at Berlin, or at St. Petersburg. I hope there will be proper provision made for our representatives, and then I should like to see a restriction of such extravagances and remedy applied now, while we are waiting for proper legations. When they are once created, then the outward appearance at least of our embassies will always be the same, but in the meanwhile I would like to see some man who vulgarly, snobbishly is flaunting his money in the face of the world called home because of that fact and because it is undemocratic and not in keeping with the spirit of our people. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania insist on his point of order?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, as chairman one often has to do things that his individual desires would incline him not to do. I must insist on the point of order, because I desire to get through with the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SIBLEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleague will reserve his point of order for five minutes.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Oh, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, my colleague, can speak for five minutes.

Mr. SIBLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word of the last paragraph.

Mr. MANN. But the last paragraph has been ruled out on a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustained the point of order to the amendment.

Mr. MANN. But it was not an amendment to any paragraph in the bill.

Mr. SIBLEY. Then I shall try to get a similar amendment in by changing the amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania for five minutes.

Mr. SIBLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] has voiced, I think, a sentiment that is in the mind of every Member of this body; yet at the same time I admit to some modification of my views as to the wisdom of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], for I have a few weeks since finished the reading of the autobiography of the Hon. Andrew D. White, for many years our diplomatic representative abroad. He was thought of so highly that President Cleveland retained him for several years at his diplomatic post.

Now, if there is one thing in all that autobiography which Mr. White emphasizes it is that we should own our own buildings at these foreign capitals, and that, by failing to do so, we not only belittle in the eyes of other nations our accredited representatives, but we eliminate in many cases from our diplomatic service the very best brains and the very best talent that the nation boasts, simply because the demands upon the individual pocket of the diplomat are so great as to preclude the services of such men. I am sure that if each Representative in this body, without prejudice, would read Mr. White's recommendations, we would all agree with him. Mr. White is a man who is now retired forever from the public arena. He is speaking to his countrymen as a distinguished educator and diplomat. He has been an honor to his nation, and all citizens justly honor him. In all his two volumes that is the one point that he makes most emphatic. I should like very much indeed, had the Chairman not ruled it out on a point of order, to see the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio prevail, although I am frank to say that until I had read Doctor White's autobiography I should have entertained an entirely different opinion. It is not unknown to Members whose faces I see on the other side of this Chamber that Mr. Cleveland sent an ambassador to Russia, a distinguished Democratic Member of Congress, who was our colleague, who came away from there, I have been led to believe, very much chagrined and

much impoverished, merely because he could not afford to hold the post which his talents so eminently qualified him to fill—the Hon. Clifton Breckinridge, of Arkansas.

Now, I want to see the wealth qualification eliminated. I want to see the ambassadors of a nation which is foremost in the commercial progress of the world, which has gone to the very front rank of nations, which is now the financial center and the industrial center of the globe, properly provided for. The expenses of a diplomat are greater now than in the days of which my friend speaks, because our interests have so tremendously multiplied that the ambassador must touch a hundred points to-day which were uncalled to his attention in a generation or two gone by; and, therefore, I hope some day, before I shall have passed off the scene of action—not political action, but while I still remain a citizen to watch events—to see suitable mansions belong to the United States as the British own one here, that shall be American soil, and which, in all the tumults and upheavals that occur in foreign capitals, if they should occur, will be recognized as soil of the United States and not subject to the riots or assaults of a mob. [Loud applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

REERECTION OF CONSULAR BUILDING AT TAHITI, SOCIETY ISLANDS.

For the reerection of the American consular building at Tahiti, Society Islands, \$5,071.45.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I will have to make a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make his point of order or reserve it?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I hope the gentleman will reserve the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Well, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I would like to state for the information of the gentleman, and I am sure he will withdraw his point of order when he hears it, that this is for the reerection of the American consulate building at Tahiti, Society Islands. This building was absolutely destroyed by a cyclone a year ago, and it is necessary that it should be put up again. The Secretary of State wrote to our chairman [Mr. HITT] as follows:

SIR: I have the honor to inform you that a cyclone and high sea which swept over Tahiti, Society Islands, on February 8 last, caused the total destruction of the American consular building there. The building destroyed was the property of this Government. It stood on ground which is quite the finest in the town of Papeeti and which can not be used by the terms of the original deed for other purposes than a consulate.

The building which it is desired to build on the present Government property will cost \$5,071.45, the estimate therefor being itemized as follows.

It is essential that this be reerection for the use of the consul, and more than that, the land, which is owned by the Government, is under such restrictions that it can not be used for any other purpose. I feel sure the gentleman from Illinois will withdraw his point of order with this information from the Secretary of State.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman inform us whether it is the policy of the Government to provide consular buildings for all the consuls of the Government? We have information here to the effect that we ought to provide buildings for all ambassadors—with which I am not in sympathy, I will say to the gentleman, at present—and I would like to know whether the Government intends to provide buildings for all consuls and consular agents, or whether it is an exception in this case?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I will state to the gentleman, the policy of the Government has not been to provide consulates with buildings; but in such out-of-the-way countries where it is impossible to get a habitable place for the use of the American representative, in some such places the Government has erected houses for the consuls, and this happens to be one of them. There is probably no house on the island that would be of sufficient size and proper to house the American consul and his family; hence the original erection of the building, and hence the necessity for its reerection, and I feel sure—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois insist upon his point of order?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I am not certain whether the item is subject to the point of order, but I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I think the item plainly is not subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to hear the gentleman from New York on the point of order.

Mr. PERKINS. As I understand the facts, Mr. Chairman, the Government of the United States owns the site upon which it has erected a building to use for consular purposes at Tahiti, Society Islands—that is to say, the purchase of that building, the erection of that building, and use of that building, as I

understand, is established law. Now, surely, Mr. Chairman, if by some accident a building belonging to the Government is subject to injury, it is not enacting new law to make the necessary appropriation for the repairs to that building, whether they are more or whether they are less.

Take the building owned by the Government mentioned here; surely the necessary repairs on any property owned by the Government, and to which the Government has acquired a legal title or proper use, then becomes an established branch of the property, and the necessary repair, like the necessary care—

The CHAIRMAN. Can the gentleman answer one question for the Chair?

Mr. PERKINS. I will if possible.

The CHAIRMAN. Was this building completely destroyed, and is this appropriation to rebuild the building, or was it simply damaged, and is this item to repair it?

Mr. PERKINS. Of course, the foundation remains. I suppose the superstructure has been rendered uninhabitable.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In connection with the question of the Chair, the language of the provision settles it.

The CHAIRMAN. That is why the Chair asked the question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The language of the provision settles it. It does not say "repair;" it says "reerection."

Mr. PERKINS. I think it is not the language of the bill that settles the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule unless the gentleman wants to be heard further. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] insist upon the point of order?

Mr. MANN. If the committee will excuse me for a second, I will say that this consul is enjoying a thousand-dollar salary now. This bill proposes to give him \$2,000 salary. The consul at this place has not a thing on earth to do but live. [Laughter.]

Mr. OTJEN. May I ask the gentleman a question? Would you go down there for \$2,000?

Mr. MANN. I may be glad of the opportunity some day. [Laughter.]

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I hope not.

Mr. MANN. I have plenty of constituents who would be glad to go there to-day for \$2,000, or probably less. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. DENBY. Will the gentleman yield for a little data concerning business in that office?

Mr. MANN. Very gladly.

Mr. DENBY. The gentleman asserted that there is no business there. The exports from that port to the United States for the last fiscal year were \$314,000. The official fees amounted to \$330.50; the notarial fees to \$44; all of which indicate a very considerable amount of business done at the consulate. Vessels cleared for the United States, 11; seamanship, 2; seamen discharged, 2; letters received and answered, 300; expenses of living, high. So the consul has manifestly something more to do than live.

Mr. MANN. He had three vessels to attend to in three hundred and sixty-five days. That is coming near to doing nothing.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Eleven vessels.

Mr. MANN. Eleven vessels.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Thirteen vessels.

Mr. MANN. Well, call it thirteen; that is an unlucky number for him.

Mr. DENBY. He had to prepare manifests for \$314,000.

Mr. MANN. For how many vessels?

Mr. DENBY. It is immaterial as to the number of vessels. It is the amount of exports that make the business of the consul. There were eleven vessels of the United States.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman understands very well that the consul does not prepare the manifests.

Mr. DENBY. If the gentleman will pardon me, I do not so understand. The consul generally does prepare the manifests, and also writes letters and signs checks.

Mr. MANN. He examines the manifests. The manifests are not prepared by the consuls. Eleven vessels mean eleven days' work, possibly, in the year's time. I think he is exceedingly well paid at \$2,000. He has a thousand dollars extra because he lost the building, and the building probably was not worth very much.

Mr. OLMSTED rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule on the point of order, unless the gentleman from Pennsylvania desires to address the Chair.

Mr. OLMSTED. I was simply going to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that in the Fifty-sixth Congress, as referred to on page 346 of the Manual, it was held that the rebuilding of a bridge in the District of Columbia was a continua-

tion of Government work in progress, and upon the argument of the present Speaker of the House. That may or may not have a bearing on this question. I have not been paying close enough attention to know precisely the question at issue here, but it seems to me it might have a bearing.

The CHAIRMAN. What page is that?

Mr. OLMSTED. Page 346 of the Manual. I had occasion recently to examine that in the RECORD, and found that the point of order in that case was overruled on the argument of the present distinguished Speaker of the House, then chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. It was a case where a bridge, once constructed by the Government, had gone away. The paragraph against which the point was urged contained an appropriation for the construction of a new bridge in place of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania the question if that was not a part of the park system of the District of Columbia?

Mr. OLMSTED. If I mistake not, the bridge was or had been across a stream running through the Zoological Garden.

The CHAIRMAN. Undoubtedly.

Mr. DENBY. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the paragraph under consideration by striking out of line 9 the word "reerection" and substitute the word "repairs."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will sustain the point of order, and will recognize the gentleman to offer an amendment.

Mr. DENBY. I offer an amendment to make the paragraph read as follows:

For the repair of the American consular building at Tahiti, Society Islands, \$5,071.45.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will have to take the language of the amendment, and unless the gentleman from Illinois desires to be heard, the Chair is ready to rule. [Cries of "Rule!"]

Mr. MANN. I have no desire whatever to prevent the construction of the building, so far as that is concerned. The point that I am making was the relation to the ruling of the Chair. Here is an admission that the building is destroyed and can not be repaired. The Chair is required to act upon facts that are before it, and I doubt very much whether the Chair could entertain the amendment with the admission made to the Chair as to what the facts are.

Mr. PERKINS. What admission is made to the Chair?

Mr. MANN. That the building has been destroyed, and could not be repaired.

Mr. PERKINS. I know of no such admission.

Mr. MANN. That is what I understood.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to state to the gentleman that when the Chair ruled upon the point of order before he ruled according to the language, although the gentleman from New York said that the appropriation was "for repairs" and not "rebuilding" the building.

Mr. MANN. Now, I am frank to say that I think the ruling is correct in both cases.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DENBY. Mr. Chairman, there should be a change in the title of the paragraph, changing it from "reerection" to "repair."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the change will be made by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

ANNUAL EXPENSES OF CAPE SPARTEL LIGHT, COAST OF MOROCCO.

Annual proportion of the expenses of Cape Spartel and Tangiers Light on the coast of Morocco, including loss by exchange—

Mr. WILLIAMS. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. It is the duty of the Clerk to read the bill, and he read "Annual proportion of the expenses of Cape Spartel and Tangiers Light on the coast of Morocco, including loss by exchange, \$325."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk informs the Chair that he had just reached the total of the paragraph.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I beg the Chair's pardon. The Clerk read "Annual proportion of the expenses of Cape Spartel and Tangiers Light on the coast of Morocco," and then went on to the next thing.

Mr. OLMSTED. No; he did not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk informs the Chair that the gentleman from Mississippi must not have heard him. The Clerk will read.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thought I heard the gentleman read "bringing."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

three hundred and twenty-five dollars.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill, as follows:

EMERGENCIES ARISING IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE.

To enable the President to meet unforeseen emergencies arising in the diplomatic and consular service, and to extend the commercial and other interests of the United States, to be expended pursuant to the requirement of section 291 of the Revised Statutes, \$90,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary. The Secretary of State is authorized to apply in his discretion such portions of the appropriation for "Contingent expenses, foreign missions," for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, to the maintenance, driving, and operating such carriages or vehicles as may be necessary for the use of the Assistant Secretaries of the Department of State in the duties officially devolving upon them, and further to apply upon the order of the President such proportion of any fund which may properly be applied to the entertainment of visiting functionaries of foreign governments to such temporary hire of carriages as may be required for the use of such Assistant Secretaries in emergencies arising in connection with the necessary entertainment of such functionaries of foreign governments in the United States, or in such other emergencies as may require such expenditures to be made.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I desire to make a point of order against the paragraph just read.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman please call the Chair's attention to the line?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. To that part of line 5, page 11, after the word "seven," down to and including the word "them," in line 9 of the same page. The point of order includes the provision authorizing carriages and vehicles for Assistant Secretaries of the Department of State. I know that it is contrary to existing law.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order upon all the paragraph after the word "necessary," in line 2 of page 11.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of the gentleman from Illinois will be reserved until that of the gentleman from Indiana is disposed of.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. A few years ago a law was passed prohibiting the use of public money for the purchase and maintenance of carriages and vehicles for assistants of the various Departments of the Government. I think the limitation expressly was for the maintenance of horses and carriages for the heads of Departments alone. My point of order simply includes that part of the paragraph that authorizes the expenditure of any appropriation carried in the bill for the purchase and maintenance of horses and vehicles for the use of Assistant Secretaries of the State Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that this is existing law, and it has been enacted since the passage of the act to which the gentleman refers. Therefore it stands as the law to-day, and was passed in contravention of that law, to show that in the judgment of the legislative body it was not applied to the Department of State. And, Mr. Chairman, to go from the legal point to the merit of the case, very properly so. We all know the functions of the Department of State differ from those of any of the other Departments. They necessarily have to do with foreign representatives and foreigners and distinguished people who come here. It is necessary under the comity of nations that certain attentions and certain entertainments should be given to foreigners, the same as are extended by them to our representatives when abroad.

For this reason it is quite necessary that the Department of State should have these carriages, and particularly that their use should be extended to the assistant secretaries, because they are the officers who are generally assigned to extend these courtesies to the visiting representatives of foreign governments and to go around with them. That is the necessity of this, and both on the point of order and on the merits I submit that the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I desire to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania where the law is that authorizes the carriages and horses for the use of assistant secretaries of the Department of State? It is simply a provision carried in the annual diplomatic appropriation bill, is it not?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Yes; but under the rules of the House that has been held to be existing law.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Under the rules of the House it has been held that it is not existing law, and in relation to the merits of the case I desire to say that a subsequent provision in the same paragraph authorizes the use of public funds in the employment of carriages and vehicles for the entertainment of foreign guests. The provision included in my point of order does not include that part of the paragraph that authorizes the employment of vehicles in the entertainment of foreign guests.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. In reply to that, I again assert that it is existing law. Further than that, it is necessary that these secretaries should have the carriages in attending to their duties. It is necessary in going about from one portion of

Washington to another. This has been described as the city of magnificent distances, and we know how far places in this city are from one another. They have to come up to the Capitol, even the Secretary of State, and in the proper performance of their duties it is necessary that they should have the use of these carriages. That has been so through many years of experience. It is nothing new. It has been in the bill for years, and it is one of the recognized necessities for the efficient service of the State Department.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois insist on the point of order?

Mr. MANN. I insist on the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to be heard?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the item itself shows that it is not existing law, because it provides for the expenditure of part of the appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, and confines itself to that specific appropriation, indicating on its face that it is not existing law. It could not be existing law in the language itself in the bill. A similar item was in the appropriation bill for the current fiscal year, referring to the appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906. Now, it will be perfectly plain to everybody that an item providing for the expenditure of the appropriation for the current fiscal year is not existing law when confined to the current fiscal year, if it is desired to apply to the ensuing fiscal year. It is not only not existing law, but it is contrary to the provision that was put in the bill some years ago, over my protest, forbidding the use of carriages, and I can see no more excuse for providing carriages for the Assistant Secretaries of State, as is done under this item, than for providing carriages for other assistant secretaries. As far as I am personally concerned, I have never seen any objection to the Government providing carriages for many of the Government officials here in Washington, who are so ill paid; but I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. PERKINS. Does the Chair sustain a point of order to the entire paragraph, after the second line?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. To all after the word "necessary," in line 2, page 11, all the remainder of that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL (WATER) BOUNDARY COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO.

To enable the Commission to continue its work under the treaties of 1884 and 1889, \$15,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, there has been an increase here of \$10,000 to the International Water Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico. I should like to have some explanation from the chairman of the committee of the cause of that increase.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I will reply to the gentleman by stating that this is a restoration, not an increase. The determination of the boundary line between the United States and Mexico, delimiting the course of the Rio Grande River, has been proceeding under an agreement between this country and Mexico. The sum appropriated in some years has been as high as \$67,000. Awaiting the confirmation of the treaty by the Senate last year, we reduced the amount from \$15,000 to \$5,000. This year we have the information that the bancos are being destroyed, and the boundary line is becoming uncertain on that account. The engineers have demanded the sum of \$15,000 to carry on the preliminary work again, the same amount they had before.

This must be done, so that if the treaty is confirmed by the Senate this preliminary work that is necessary will be provided for. It is under the agreement that exists between Mexico and the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As I understand, the terms of the treaty have been agreed upon.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. They have been agreed upon, but not confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Has the gentleman any idea what the life of this commission will be? When will it terminate its existence?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. I can not tell the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What was it originally created to do, if the gentleman can tell me, so that I may arrive at a guess as to when it may come to an end?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. It was created to study the flow of the waters of the Rio Grande, which are continually shifting. The treaty between Mexico and the United States in regard to the line between those countries was settled as the middle of the Rio Grande River. That is a shifting stream, like many shallow streams, and this commission was established

so that if the river was going to change continually some definite boundary might be fixed independent of the bed of the river.

Mr. WILLIAMS. To prescribe a boundary which by mutual agreement would become the boundary regardless of the Rio Grande? Now, then, how many years has that work been going on?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. This commission was established under the protocol of May, 1896, for the equitable distribution of the waters of the Rio Grande, and it has been going on ever since, from time to time. It also involves a plan for damming the waters of the Rio Grande in its upper part and distributing them for the purpose of irrigation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is the commission to do all that?

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. The Commission is investigating all that and is doing the preliminary work. It can be done together, as the gentleman can see very well, because they are studying the flow of the waters and the shifting of the bed of the Rio Grande River for a double purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The reason I asked the gentleman the question is this: We are creating a great many commissions, commissions of every description, and a commission seems to be endowed with perpetual life. A commission never dies unless Congress at some time gets angry and takes a cudgel and hits the commission over the head. I didn't know but that this Commission was of that sort, but from the explanation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania this Commission seems to have some little work to do.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. The Commission is composed of United States engineers who do not draw any extra salary, and I will say to the gentleman that the treaty under consideration before the Senate will bring this thing to a termination.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is possible to finish this bill to-night, and I therefore move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the committee determined to rise, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CURTIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill and had instructed him to report that it had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 17507. An act to open for settlement 505,000 acres of land in the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indian reservations, in Oklahoma Territory.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 1133. An act granting a pension to Mary Lockard;
H. R. 4222. An act granting a pension to Otto Boesewetter;
H. R. 4388. An act granting a pension to Laura Hilgeman;
H. R. 4406. An act granting a pension to Albert M. Ryan;
H. R. 4867. An act granting a pension to Louisa Gregg;
H. R. 7495. An act granting a pension to Susie M. Gerth;
H. R. 8144. An act granting a pension to Ada J. Lasswell;
H. R. 8833. An act granting a pension to Edna M. Johnson;
H. R. 8954. An act granting a pension to George Cunningham;
H. R. 9135. An act granting a pension to August Crome;
H. R. 9276. An act granting a pension to Mary E. O'Hare;
H. R. 10177. An act granting a pension to Elizabeth Kohler;
H. R. 10766. An act granting a pension to Rachel L. Bartlett;
H. R. 11303. An act granting a pension to Joseph Matthews;
H. R. 11686. An act granting a pension to William C. Berg-

hahn;
H. R. 12194. An act granting a pension to Minnie Irwin;
H. R. 12561. An act granting a pension to Francis M. McClendon;

H. R. 12653. An act granting a pension to Sarah Adams;
H. R. 12807. An act granting a pension to Nancy Ann Gee;
H. R. 12874. An act granting a pension to Sarah Ellen Dickens;

H. R. 13024. An act granting a pension to William J. Beach;
H. R. 13421. An act granting a pension to John W. Wabrass;
H. R. 13575. An act granting a pension to Frances Bell;
H. R. 13622. An act granting a pension to Mary Cochran;
H. R. 13704. An act granting a pension to Ann Dewier;
H. R. 13713. An act granting a pension to Allison W. Pollard;
H. R. 15032. An act granting a pension to Milton Diehl;
H. R. 15243. An act granting a pension to Artemesia T. Hus-

brook;
H. R. 15486. An act granting a pension to William H. M. Carpenter;

H. R. 15490. An act granting a pension to Mary E. Darcy;
H. R. 15523. An act granting a pension to Jose N. Lucero, alias Nasario Lucero;

H. R. 15588. An act granting a pension to Hester Hyatt;
H. R. 15695. An act granting a pension to John T. Wagoner;
H. R. 15807. An act granting a pension to Catharine Arnold;
H. R. 15855. An act granting a pension to Will E. Kayser;
H. R. 16173. An act granting a pension to Sarah Smith;
H. R. 16267. An act granting a pension to Catharine Piper;
H. R. 16320. An act granting a pension to Esther M. Noah;
H. R. 16390. An act granting a pension to Katharine Part-

ridge;
H. R. 16627. An act granting a pension to Delilah Moore;
H. R. 16681. An act granting a pension to Gustave Bergen;
H. R. 16704. An act granting a pension to Lucy C. Strout;
H. R. 16931. An act granting a pension to Cornelia Mitchell;
H. R. 17108. An act granting a pension to Edith F. Morrison;
H. R. 17120. An act granting a pension to Rhoda Munsil;
H. R. 17205. An act granting a pension to Alice Garvey;

H. R. 17308. An act granting a pension to Margaret E. Ever-

land;
H. R. 17548. An act granting a pension to David J. Bentley;
H. R. 17558. An act granting a pension to Lizzie H. Prout;
H. R. 17586. An act granting a pension to Harriet A. Morton;
H. R. 17671. An act granting a pension to Sarah A. Thompson;

H. R. 17690. An act granting a pension to Ellen E. Leary;
H. R. 17788. An act granting a pension to Charles E. Benson;
H. R. 17826. An act granting a pension to Wincy A. Lindsey;
H. R. 18005. An act granting a pension to Emily Compton;
H. R. 18157. An act granting a pension to James J. Winkler;
H. R. 18158. An act granting a pension to Isaac Cope;
H. R. 18169. An act granting a pension to Margaret Stevens;
H. R. 549. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles

W. Storr, jr.;

H. R. 718. An act granting an increase of pension to Hamilton D. Brown;

H. R. 735. An act granting an increase of pension to Frank L. Fornshell;

H. R. 1182. An act granting an increase of pension to Ezekiel Bridwell;

H. R. 1192. An act granting an increase of pension to George B. Hess;

H. R. 1413. An act granting an increase of pension to John Crawford;

H. R. 1482. An act granting an increase of pension to Philip Cook;

H. R. 1547. An act granting an increase of pension to William A. Olmsted;

H. R. 1557. An act granting an increase of pension to Frank J. Oatley;

H. R. 1719. An act granting an increase of pension to William N. Whitlock;

H. R. 1768. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Childers;

H. R. 1946. An act granting an increase of pension to James A. Sproull;

H. R. 2155. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Smith;

H. R. 2168. An act granting an increase of pension to William Bridges;

H. R. 2226. An act granting an increase of pension to George F. Long;

H. R. 2234. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob W. Gerstenecker;

H. R. 2791. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Adams;

H. R. 2816. An act granting an increase of pension to James C. Town;

H. R. 3227. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac Tuttle;

H. R. 3345. An act granting an increase of pension to Christina White;

H. R. 3686. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry R. Cowan;

H. R. 3694. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph D. Emery;

H. R. 4240. An act granting an increase of pension to James F. Chipman;

H. R. 4244. An act granting an increase of pension to John Spaulding;

H. R. 4363. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas D. Campbell;

H. R. 4594. An act granting an increase of pension to Joshua S. Ditto;

H. R. 4595. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Tallant;
 H. R. 4625. An act granting an increase of pension to Anderson J. Smith;
 H. R. 4743. An act granting an increase of pension to Hiram N. Goodell;
 H. R. 4745. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry D. Stiehl;
 H. R. 4965. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Holland;
 H. R. 5048. An act granting an increase of pension to William A. Faller;
 H. R. 5222. An act granting an increase of pension to Lewis R. Stegman;
 H. R. 5571. An act granting an increase of pension to William Cary;
 H. R. 5732. An act granting an increase of pension to Elias C. Kitchin;
 H. R. 5804. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Noyes;
 H. R. 6061. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Chapman;
 H. R. 6111. An act granting an increase of pension to Edwin R. Steenrod;
 H. R. 6112. An act granting an increase of pension to Edmund Fish;
 H. R. 6114. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Douglass;
 H. R. 6490. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Gilbert;
 H. R. 6498. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac C. France;
 H. R. 6546. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. White;
 H. R. 6578. An act granting an increase of pension to James B. McWhorter;
 H. R. 6776. An act granting an increase of pension to Stephen C. Smith;
 H. R. 6865. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Voss;
 H. R. 6912. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Weaver;
 H. R. 7419. An act granting an increase of pension to James Scott;
 H. R. 7498. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Hanson;
 H. R. 7500. An act granting an increase of pension to John McCandless;
 H. R. 7584. An act granting an increase of pension to James H. Kemp;
 H. R. 7876. An act granting an increase of pension to Julius Beier;
 H. R. 8091. An act granting an increase of pension to John Coughlin;
 H. R. 8138. An act granting an increase of pension to Similde E. Forbes;
 H. R. 8479. An act granting an increase of pension to Nellie A. Batchelder;
 H. R. 8547. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Madison;
 H. R. 8650. An act granting an increase of pension to Sewell F. Graves;
 H. R. 8662. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward F. Paramore;
 H. R. 8716. An act granting an increase of pension to John L. Coffey;
 H. R. 8737. An act granting an increase of pension to Horace A. Manley;
 H. R. 8771. An act granting an increase of pension to Florence Sullivan;
 H. R. 9034. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary F. McCauley; and
 H. R. 9138. An act granting an increase of pension to Aaron L. Lockwood.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

Mr. HOLLIDAY requested leave of absence for two weeks, on account of important business.

Mr. BOWERSOCK requested leave of absence for two days, on account of important business.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the requests be granted.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Thursday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communication was taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce and Labor submitting an estimate of reappropriation for salaries and expenses of special attorneys and examiners—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. CURTIS, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10715) to establish an additional collection district in the State of Texas, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4555); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FOSS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14975) amending chapter 863, volume 31, of the Statutes at Large, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4556); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4403) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States," approved March 3, 1903, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4558); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19520) to authorize the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway Company of Montana to construct a railroad bridge across the Missouri River in Montana, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4559); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6) granting an increase of pension to Ella N. Harvey, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4449); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 20) granting an increase of pension to Edward Higgins, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4450); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 215) granting an increase of pension to Elias Phelps, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4451); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 225) granting an increase of pension to Thomas R. Smith, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4452); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 453) granting an increase of pension to George K. Green, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4453); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 586) granting an increase of pension to Corydon W. Sanborn, reported the same

without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4454); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 668) granting an increase of pension to John C. Rassbach, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4455); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 722) granting a pension to Annis Bailey, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4456); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 764) granting an increase of pension to Robert Carney, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4457); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 911) granting an increase of pension to Julius A. Davis, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4458); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1174) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Morgan, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4459); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1224) granting an increase of pension to William A. Bowles, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4460); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1256) granting an increase of pension to Lewis D. Moore, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4461); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1264) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Shiney, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4462); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1428) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Lamprey, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4463); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1443) granting an increase of pension to Hiram C. Clark, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4464); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1510) granting an increase of pension to Byron K. May, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4465); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1570) granting an increase of pension to Lydia A. Johnson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4466); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1664) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth L. W. Bailey, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4467); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1849) granting an increase of pension to David T. Pettie, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4468); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1855) granting an increase of pension to James J. Brown, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4469); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1865) granting an increase of pension to Solomon H. Baker, reported the

same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4470); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2008) granting a pension to Virginia A. McKnight, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4471); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2032) granting an increase of pension to Thomas F. Stevens, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4472); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2179) granting an increase of pension to G. Annie Gregg, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4473); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2429) granting an increase of pension to James Devor, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4474); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2619) granting an increase of pension to William H. Willie, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4475); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2728) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Carr, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4476); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2791) granting an increase of pension to John Lindt, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4477); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2852) granting a pension to Bridget Manahan, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4478); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3261) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Towne, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4479); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3270) granting an increase of pension to William H. Richardson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4480); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3486) granting an increase of pension to Edwin D. Wescott, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4481); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3487) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Fuller, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4482); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3553) granting an increase of pension to William Oliver, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4483); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3629) granting an increase of pension to William Hibbs, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4484); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3684) granting an increase of pension to George W. Hyde, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4485); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3728) granting an increase of pension to William H. Winans, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4486); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3750) granting an increase of pension to Wilbur F. Flint, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4487); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3814) granting an increase of pension to John Giffen, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4488); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3904) granting an increase of pension to George J. Thomas, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4489); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4092) granting an increase of pension to John Smith, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4490); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4133) granting an increase of pension to George Brewster, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4491); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4171) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Bovee, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4492); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4173) granting an increase of pension to Catherine E. Smith, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4493); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4205) granting an increase of pension to George Warner, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4494); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4346) granting an increase of pension to William E. Holloway, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4495); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4372) granting an increase of pension to Emily P. Hubbard, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4496); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4458) granting an increase of pension to Andrew P. Quist, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4497); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4492) granting an increase of pension to George W. Fletcher, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4498); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4497) granting an increase of pension to Augustus McDowell, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4499); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4550) granting an increase of pension to Henry Moody, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4500); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4719) granting an increase of pension to John Joines, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4501); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4770) granting an increase of pension to Edward Hart, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4502); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4784) granting an increase of pension to Lemuel Cross, reported the same without amendment, accom-

panied by a report (No. 4503); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4790) granting an increase of pension to Edward W. Smith, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4504); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4879) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Baker, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4505); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4887) granting an increase of pension to Calvin C. Hussey, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4506); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4910) granting an increase of pension to William Wright, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4507); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4937) granting an increase of pension to John Reece, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4508); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5022) granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Olney, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4509); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5032) granting an increase of pension to Daisy C. Stuyvesant, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4510); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5085) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Donovan, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4511); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5143) granting an increase of pension to Eugene V. McKnight, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4512); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5152) granting an increase of pension to Holaway W. Kinney, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4513); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5158) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Fosdick, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4514); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5169) granting an increase of pension to James A. Price, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4515); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5256) granting an increase of pension to John Johnson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4516); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5290) granting an increase of pension to James Ramsey, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4517); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5326) granting an increase of pension to Annie A. West, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4518); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5442) granting a

pension to Frances E. Taylor, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4519); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5501) granting an increase of pension to Jacob L. Kline, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4520); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5557) granting an increase of pension to Henry Clay Sloan, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4521); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5559) granting an increase of pension to Ann H. Crofton, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4522); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5583) granting an increase of pension to Foster L. Banister, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4523); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5700) granting an increase of pension to Stacy B. Warford, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4524); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5708) granting an increase of pension to Nathalia Boepple, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4525); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5728) granting an increase of pension to Emery Wyman, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4526); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5731) granting an increase of pension to James McTwiggan, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4527); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5742) granting an increase of pension to James A. Bryant, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4528); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5758) granting an increase of pension to Joshua J. Clark, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4529); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5765) granting an increase of pension to Theodore F. Montgomery, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4530); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5767) granting an increase of pension to Thomas D. Welch, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4531); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5772) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Harris, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4532); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5775) granting an increase of pension to Harvey M. Traver, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4533); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5784) granting an increase of pension to Mahala F. Campbell, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4534); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5785) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Doughty, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4535); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5790) granting an increase of pension to Jehial P. Hammond, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4536); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5800) granting an increase of pension to James N. Davis, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4537); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5801) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Jackson Paris, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4538); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5803) granting an increase of pension to William H. Meadows, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4539); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5808) granting an increase of pension to Washington Brockman, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4540); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5809) granting an increase of pension to Hannah C. Church, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4541); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5834) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Sheldon, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4542); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5844) granting an increase of pension to John Keys, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4543); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5855) granting an increase of pension to Blanche Badger, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4544); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5902) granting an increase of pension to George W. Webster, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4545); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5928) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Gaffney, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4546); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5932) granting an increase of pension to Elijah R. Merriman, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4547); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5948) granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. Rice, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4548); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5949) granting an increase of pension to George F. White, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4549); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5966) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Davis, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4550); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5969) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Burdick, reported the same

without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4551); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6024) granting an increase of pension to Franklin B. Beach, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4552); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6034) granting an increase of pension to William A. Hopper, alias Cuff Watson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4553); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6063) granting an increase of pension to Frances A. Sullivan, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4554); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GREGG, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18007) to authorize the appointment of Acting Asst. Surg. Julian Taylor Miller, United States Navy, as an assistant surgeon in the United States Navy, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 4557); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 19811) to enlarge the authority of the Mississippi River Commission in making allotments and expenditures of funds appropriated by Congress for the improvement of the Mississippi River—to the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 19812) to enlarge the authority of the Mississippi River Commission in making allotments and expenditures of funds appropriated by Congress for the improvement of the Mississippi River—to the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 19813) to furnish bronze medals of honor to surviving soldiers who responded to President Lincoln's first call for troops—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOUSER: A bill (H. R. 19814) authorizing the issue of obsolete ordnance and ordnance stores for use of State and Territorial educational institutions and to State soldiers and sailors' orphans' homes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 19815) to authorize the Georgia, Florida and Alabama Railway Company to construct a bridge across the Chattahoochee River, between Columbus, Ga., and Franklin, Ga.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 19816) to authorize the Georgia, Florida and Alabama Railroad Company to construct three railroad bridges across the Chattahoochee River, one at or near the city of Eufaula, Ala., and two between said city of Eufaula and the city of Columbus, Ga.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 19817) appropriating the receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands in certain States to the construction of works for the drainage or reclamation of swamp and overflowed lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MORRELL: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 165) making Saturday afternoon a half holiday for certain employees of the Government—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: A resolution (H. Res. 543) requesting certain information of the President of the United States concerning the meat-trust investigation—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A resolution (H. Res. 544) touching conditions in the meat-packing industry—to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AIKEN: A bill (H. R. 19818) granting an increase of pension to William F. Clinkscales—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19819) granting an increase of pension to Johanna Kearney—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 19820) granting a pension to William H. Jenkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19821) granting a pension to Irvin Ingle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 19822) granting a pension to James H. Peistrup—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 19823) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus A. G. Rayhouser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAWSON: A bill (H. R. 19824) granting a pension to Lovisa M. Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 19825) for the relief of the estate of Alexander M. Byers, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GAINES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 19826) granting an increase of pension to George A. Porterfield—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY: A bill (H. R. 19827) granting an increase of pension to Erastus Mack—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19828) granting an increase of pension to John L. Cooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19829) granting an increase of pension to Moses T. Kelly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 19830) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Adcock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 19831) granting a pension to Clarence B. Sidener—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 19832) granting an increase of pension to George W. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOUSER: A bill (H. R. 19833) granting an increase of pension to Morgan Burk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLCOTT: A bill (H. R. 19834) granting a pension to James A. Lessey, alias Lasey or Lacy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 19835) granting an increase of pension to Ernst Keiselbach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19836) granting an increase of pension to Hiram M. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19837) providing for the payment of certain coupons of bonds issued pursuant to an act of the legislature of the State of California to pay the expenses of suppressing Indian hostilities—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 19838) to authorize the appointment of Acting Asst. Surg. G. R. Plummer, United States Navy, as an assistant surgeon in the United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 19839) granting an increase of pension to Thomas P. Bright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19840) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Bracey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19841) granting an increase of pension to Owen A. Back—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19842) granting an increase of pension to Peter Vincent—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19843) granting an increase of pension to Daniel S. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Merchants' Association of New York City, for the enactment of certain Senate amendments to the railway rate bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. AIKEN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Susan M. Brunson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William F. Clinkscales—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Mary F. Johnson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BEIDLER: Petition of citizens of Ohio, against religious legislation in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: Petition of citizens of Maine, for re-

peal of revenue tax on denaturalized alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Joseph P. Phillips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Petition of the Patriotic Order Sons of America of Florida, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Knights of Columbia State Council of Florida, for bill H. R. 13304—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. DAWSON: Petition of the Iowa Retail Merchants' Association, for the pure-food bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DUNWELL: Petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, for certain Senate amendments to the railway rate bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the American Protective Tariff League, for exclusive use of American material in the construction of the Panama Canal—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of A. Buchanan's Sons, for two classes of mail matter only, 1-cent letter postage, and 1 cent for 3 ounces on periodicals, etc.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. EDWARDS: Paper to accompany bill for relief of G. W. Morgan—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FINLEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Amelia D. Robertson (previously referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions)—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLOOD: Petition of Mrs. Elsie Pfeiffer, for an appropriation of \$10,000 for furtherance of her work and achievements in the science of astronomy—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the Chicago Commercial Association, for legislation to promote commerce by improvement of our merchant marine—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition of the board of directors of the Merchants' Association of San Francisco, Cal., for drawback on import duties on building material for San Francisco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARSHALL: Petition of citizens of North Dakota, for a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of North Dakota, for a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petition of the Merchants' Association of San Francisco, for drawback on import duties on building material for San Francisco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mary Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RYAN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Warren A. Woodson—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: Petition of the State Camp of the Florida Patriotic Order Sons of America, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, May 31, 1906.

Prayer by Rev. ULYSSES G. B. PIERCE, of the city of Washington.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday last, when, on request of Mr. GALLINGER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with. The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal stands approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PLATT presented petitions of 43,226 women of the State of New York, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. GALLINGER presented sundry petitions of citizens of the District of Columbia, and a petition of the East Washington Heights Citizens' Association, of Washington, D. C., praying for the adoption of a certain amendment to the District of Columbia appropriation bill providing for the location of a public park in the eastern section of the District; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Malden and Everett, in the State of Massachusetts, praying for an in-

vestigation into the existing conditions in the Kongo Free State; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. KEAN presented petitions of members of the public high schools of Vineland and Hoboken, in the State of New Jersey, praying for the ratification of international arbitration treaties; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HANSBROUGH presented petitions of 1,659 women of the State of North Dakota, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. STONE presented petitions of 11,697 women of the State of Missouri, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented the memorial of Phoebe W. Couzins, of the State of Missouri, remonstrating against the removal of Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah, from the United States Senate; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. BURKETT presented a memorial of the Women's Home Missionary Society, of Hebron, Nebr., remonstrating against the transfer of the education of the Indians and Eskimos in Alaska from the Bureau of Education to the governor of that Territory; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. CARMACK presented petitions of 4,158 women of the State of Tennessee, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. SCOTT presented a petition of the West Virginia Wholesale Grocers' Association, praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill," and also for the repeal of the present bankruptcy law; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCUMBER presented a petition of the Produce Merchants' Association of Portland, Oreg., praying for the enactment of legislation to abolish private car lines; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. DOLLIVER presented petitions of 15,572 women of the State of Iowa, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. TILLMAN. I present petitions of citizens of the State of South Carolina to the number of 964, mostly women, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah. I move that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RAYNER presented petitions of 2,176 women of the State of Maryland, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. PROCTOR presented petitions of 4,849 women of the State of Vermont, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. KITTREDGE presented petitions of 2,198 women of the State of South Dakota, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. BERRY presented sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 5651) for the relief of the estate of John Jones, deceased; which were referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SPOONER presented petitions of 7,881 women of the State of Wisconsin, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. KNOX presented a petition of the Junior Union of the Oakland Baptist Church, of Pittsburg, Pa., and a petition of 44 citizens of Washington, Pa., praying for an investigation into the existing conditions in the Kongo Free State; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of 204 citizens of Altoona, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings, grounds, and ships; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.